God has put everything in nature, too much for all, but enough for any one of us. In Canada, particularly, we are in a state of overaffluence; our output for 1971 will reach $90 billion; the per capita output is thus $4,200, namely $21,000 for every household of five persons, or $350 per month per person or $1,750 per month for every household.

Then, with such a production, we would have no reason to complain. It is not production which is lacking, it is distribution between citizens who are entitled to that production and who do not benefit from it because of poor management on the part of responsible citizens.

I believe that the Canadian government must prove that it intends to discharge its responsibilities by all possible means and, among the means available to the Canadian government is the financing of public capital through advances of credit without interest, and through the Bank of Canada, without depriving anybody of anything, without bringing the economic life to a stop, without inducing either inflation or deflation. We anticipate that that measure would greatly contribute to improve the standard of living of all Canadians. This, it is easy to see, would lead to a decrease in the taxes the government now levies to pay the interest on the public debt or its loans, and to an increase in the amount of money now available to the consumer to buy the goods he needs.

At this point in the debate, though the Ralliement créditiste does not have the support of many members as far as the adoption of a national dividend is concerned, it does have the support of many members who favour the creation of new credits, interest-free, to finance public capital.

In his book *Demain c'est l'an 2000,* Gaston Bardet, professor of applied economics at the University of Brussels, after a thorough study of the banking system, and the survey made in Great Britain by the MacMillan commission, as well as those made in Canada in 1939 by the House of Commons committee on banking and commerce, reaches the following conclusions:

> Therefore, there are two possible methods of financing and they are totally incompatible: the first being provided by savings, or surplus money, the other being projected ahead. As far as the former is concerned, he says, in relation with private production, self-regulation must be provided by the supply of existing capital, (and on this point, by the way, we are not in agreement with Mr. Bardet) and where the latter is concerned, self-regulation must be provided by the most positive primary needs.
>
> Hence, bank financing is quite appropriate where a country's capital expenditures are concerned and then the whole country benefits. Wherever over-production is not to be feared, it is demand that determines the issue. Then, in this instance, the requirements in the fields of housing, road-building, bridges, hospitals, schools, forests, become the regulating factors of the anticipated scriptural money.
>
> There again, adds Mr. Bardet, we are dealing with consumer and no longer with producer loans. Interest then is out of the question. The country, the community, cannot practise usury.

Another economist has considered the problem of government financing, and he came to the conclusions drawn by the Créditistes a long time ago, that is financing public capital by new credit free of interest.

Social Credit Monetary Policy

This proposition is explained in a book entitled: *"The Challenge of Abundance"* by Mr. Robert Théobald, and this book can be found in the Parliamentary Library.

In this respect Mr. Théobald writes:

> A government may use three means in order to get the funds it needs to meet its obligations. Firstly it can tax the citizens and the institutions in order to get their money. Secondly it can borrow money from the people and from institutions and pay an interest on it.
>
> In the third place, it can just create money and use the funds created for its purchases. What everyone agreed on before 1936 is that the government should never create money. Opposition to the creation of money was based on the belief that the demand for goods should always be equal to the supply, so long as the government did not intervene in the economy. Keynes destroyed that belief when he showed that there was no certainty that the demand was always equal to the supply in affluent countries—
>
> There are many methods for closing the gap between supply and demand. The level of supply could be brought down without great effect on demand by reducing the number of working hours for the same salary. Demand could be increased by telling the population that more goods are required in order to live a decent life and enjoy a better standard of living.
>
> The government could simply make up the difference between actual and potential production by building new schools, demolishing slums and controlling pollution, because one could find there unused resources in the economy. The government would not have to raise money by levying taxes or borrowing.
>
> Money could be merely created, the additional funds would not cause inflation because, by definition, there would not be any shortage of products.

This is the evidence given by American economist Robert Théobald who feels that it is possible to democratize money and use new credits without interest for the social development and equipment of the country.

Moreover, I want to point out the views of a renown British engineer whose opinions are raising great interest in England. No. 5 of Volume 183, Part I of the 1968-69 Proceedings of England's Institution of Mechanical Engineers reproduces the integral text of a lecture given to the members of this organization by Mr. Anthony Vickers, with the abovementioned title.

In this study, Mr. Vickers, who was heartily applauded and whose comments were the subject of discussions among the members of the Institution, dealt first of all with the technological development, the hopes it awakens from the economic development point of view. Then, in the second part of his address, he talked about the means of financing social development. This is how he concluded this part of his lecture:

> A first requirement of education is to make everybody able to understand the simple facts and the functions of money (coins, bank notes, and bank credit) under its various forms. This does not mean endless studies about economic and monetary policies. It means that everybody should be able to understand that:
>
> (1) Money is a medium of exchange or a method of payment and, in itself, it has no value and does not cost anything.
>
> (2) The control and regularization of the quantity of money required must be greatly improved in order to meet technological advances and the changes due to a capital-intensive industry.

In the last part of his address, the author explains how it would be possible, within the limits of a total employ-