

away from the people. The second is: You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it. Third: You cannot legislate the poor into economic freedom by legislating the wealthy out of it. Fourth: That which one man receives without working for, another man must work for without receiving.

Nothing can kill the initiative of a people more quickly than for half of them to get the idea that they need not work because the other half will feed them or take care of them, and for the other half to get the idea that it does no good to work since someone else receives the rewards of their labours.

I am well aware of the trend of conditions, not only in my own country but in other countries as well—countries that I have visited, worked in, attended seminars in, and lectured in. I am firmly convinced that this does not come so much from the people.

In a society of free men, competence is a primary duty. The man who does his job well tones up the whole society, and the man who does a sloppy job—whether he is a janitor or a judge, a surgeon or a mechanic—lowers the tone of all society. But, excellence implies more than competence. It implies a striving for the highest standards in every form of life. We need individual excellence in political life, in education, in industry, in medicine—in short, universally—and, not the least, we need excellence in standards of individual conduct.

A truly democratic society cannot force any person or persons, or professional group into any service unless in time of national emergency, and then under emergency powers. The great advances in medicine have come under free medicine—that is, in countries where government does not control or direct the practice of medicine. Who raised the average life expectancy from 49 years in 1900, to 72 years and better today? Was it labour leaders, radio and TV wise men, or newspaper columnists? Assuredly it was not the members of political parties. It was, and is, medical science.

Germany's unprecedented prowess in this regard came almost to an end 15 years after Bismarck's scheme was introduced. Today most of the advances are coming from the United States of America. As William Pitt stated in 1783:

Necessity is the plea for every infringement of freedom. It is the cry of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves.

The planners cry for preventive medicine, but beyond good food, exercise, clean water, milk, and vaccinations, this is shibboleth. Who

can tell when a man is going to have a heart attack or cerebrovascular accident, arthritis, pneumonia, or cancer?

Let me illustrate a little further. In Great Britain for the fiscal years 1949-50, \$1,410 million was the budgeted cost of the new health scheme, which is just about 75 per cent more than what the brilliant minister had figured nine months earlier, and a good third over what the Beveridge Plan estimated for 1955. In 1965-66 it was \$4 billion a year.

It is only in recent years that doctors have become exercised about politics and economics, being forced into this by the pressure of politicians and latter-day socialist economists. Until a few years ago it was rare to see in any medical journal an article on medical economics. These journals were filled with scientific articles and clinical data on medical progress. Indeed, the only concern was the patient and the advancement of medical knowledge.

The British National Health Service, for example, although it was a comprehensive, ambitious and Utopian undertaking, incapable of being realized, remains, despite superficial alterations, a sacred cow of British politics. The labour party seems to be busily engaged in trying to kill whatever remains of a medical service market. Why should this be so? It may be due to the inability of the public—and this assuredly is not confined to Great Britain—to dispel the illusion that they are receiving something for nothing. Doctors are not trained to think politically; they are trained to think scientifically. Physicians, individually or as a group, have never tried to win any popularity contests. They have tried to protect the dignity of the profession.

Young British doctors are quitting their nation's program of "free" health care, and are emigrating, presumably to the United States. This disenchantment points up the extent to which reality has intruded into a socialist dream. Although the British Government now says it plans to build some hospitals, and to expand medical schools, it is apparent that a socialist vision has been blurred by some harsh economics. According to the *London Illustrated News* of September 17, 1966, they are not only walking to get out—they are running.

The adage, "People who get everything for next to nothing think next to nothing of everything they get," epitomizes a human reaction so automatic that it is scarcely even conscious. Given the meagreness of our pocket-books, we cannot help but be rational to the extent of economizing with things which are