

member says, "a capital levy". Well, let me say that when this war is over, there will probably be a capital levy, perhaps not in the form in which it was suggested after the last war, but a levy on accumulated wealth in order that we may retire some of the debt which we are accumulating for two purposes: to defend our institutions; and, as parts of those institutions, the people who are managing to control the property of this country at the present time. I have no doubt that just as, seven or eight years ago, succession duties and death duties were proposed in this house and were more or less scorned, so, when this war is over, we shall have to find ways and means of meeting war obligations, and one of those ways and means, I predict, will be a levy on accumulated wealth.

With those few words I wish to conclude what I have to say. I am glad to see that we have taken this step, at least, in the right direction.

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) as my professor of modern history. He should know that, after the Prussian war, France had to pay five billions of francs—cinq milliards—and it was paid in a very short time, on account of the reserve which the French peasant had in his woollen sock. On that account the war was not so hard on France as it would have been had France been living on government proposals such as those advocated by the hon. gentlemen upon your extreme left.

Furthermore, in these times, the cause of the defeat of France is to be found in the devaluation of the franc. This measure decreased so much the values of the currency possessed by Frenchmen who had annuities from the state that they became communists; they had not the same interest in defending their country as when they were owners and proprietors.

The right of ownership is something which has existed since the beginning of time, but of recent years it has been gradually replaced by theories which are most dangerous to the welfare of any country. I am in favour of the old order of things. It seems to me that our mistake is to go always ahead and forget that the best is in the past. Instead of trying always to go forward into uncharted seas, we should return to the old principles which have assured during scores of years the prosperity of this country.

For the past twenty years the teachings of economists and social scientists in all the universities of the world have been responsible

[Mr. Coldwell.]

for the misinformed young men who, though having no experience of life, have been accepted as experts and who now find themselves in the role of Moses—and I insist on Moses—the Moses' who are supposed to bring the people of Israel into the promised land. In saying that, I do not make a pun on the Goldenbergs, the Rasminskys, the Cohens and the Heapses who infest the civil service of Ottawa. I refer only to the example of the old times. Moses never entered the promised land; he saw it only from a distance, and afterwards his people got in.

I wonder whether it is not better to reflect a little upon the emptiness of modern theories of social science and economics, and go back to the experience of ages for the drafting of policies to be applied in this country.

There was, of course, the experiment of President Roosevelt in the United States. He had a brain trust, but he dispensed with it. Now we have one, and I wonder whether it is not time to get rid of it and to revert to policies which have proved so satisfactory in times past.

I shall not pursue this topic at length, because I understand that there is to be a government statement, but I protest against all new policies until there is some justification for them, and the views of so-called experts do not constitute any justification, because they are not experts; they have not the least experience of ordinary business; they have no contact with the people, and they are the most dangerous citizens that we can find in this country.

Some people are surprised at the way things are going. The government is not to blame. I have every sympathy with the ministers. The only reproach I might make against them is their proneness to accept with closed eyes and open mouths the theories which are offered to them by these young freshmen or sophomores.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): For one moment I wish to detain the house for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that, in the absence of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell) has given expression to opinions which it is perfectly proper for him to have and to give expression to. The only thing I regret is that he should have done so in the absence of the one whom he was criticizing. The leader of the opposition will have his own opportunities of replying to that criticism if he sees fit; but I think it is right to make