

it goes, but it does not go nearly far enough. In fact, it stops practically where it ought to start.

The war caused the expansion of the research council's work. What for? To help Canada and her allies to win the war. The close of the war ought to cause the expansion of the council's work. What for? To help Canada and her allies win the peace. Shall we consider the act for a few moments in the light of that state of affairs? In order to do so, shall we ask ourselves this most challenging question: What is the problem which, above all other problems, needs to be solved in order that Canada should aid her allies in winning the peace? After answering that question to our satisfaction, let us ask this other question: Does this act apparently envisage the carrying on of such investigations by the national research council as would enable Canada to solve that problem?

To help the united nations win the peace, the council ought to study the problems of social science, the problem of how to enable mankind to live together. Surely that must be obvious. The science of producing goods and services has already progressed so far that production has far outstripped consumption. It had done so fifteen years ago. Canadians do not know how to distribute fully what they have now learned to produce; yet this act is apparently to concentrate on the problem of greater production and to give no attention whatsoever to the problem of consumption or distribution.

Any government that is willing to face realities realistically should have provided that its research council should concentrate much of its effort upon the problem of how to distribute. Recently it has been said that the science of living together has lagged far behind. It is well said. Then let us by all means bring up to date our social science or science of living together.

Even before the war Canada needed a new method of distribution. What caused the depression which blighted this nation in the ten years preceding the war? What caused it if not the fact that we had learned how to produce more than we could distribute? An hon. member will recall, it was commonly said in those days that we had overproduction. After the word had been used for about five years, someone suggested that we ought to say underconsumption instead of overproduction. That was the wise thing to say under the circumstances.

During the war our productive capacity expanded tremendously, and to no man in Canada will history accord more honour for

that achievement than to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe), who is now piloting this bill through the house. The figures which have been used rather commonly are these, that during the last year of the war Canada was producing nine billion dollars' worth of goods in a year. If that seems to the minister not the right figure he might interject a correction, but, as I recall, those are the figures which were used by the Bank of Canada.

Surely, now that the war is over, the necessity for a new and scientific method of distribution is greatly aggravated. If we needed such a method before the war, how much greater is our need now? This was true even before the discovery of atomic energy. To use the abundance resulting from the industrial employment of atomic energy, we simply must have a scientific method of distribution. Great numbers of machines have never been permitted to come into use because they would have thrown so many men out of employment that the millions of the world would have been thrown into chaos. What an inconceivable number of men are likely to be thrown out of work by the industrial use of atomic energy, the mind really dreads to contemplate. What unimaginable chaos would result from the stupendous production attainable through the use of atomic energy, coupled with the tragically ineffective distribution system which has afflicted mankind and still prevails, one recoils from considering.

To illustrate how serious the situation is for the world, may I refer to a statement made during the war by the late President Roosevelt? As I recall it, he made the statement in October, 1944. He said that after the war he wanted the United States to find sixty million jobs by trebling her exports of goods into the markets of the world. In other words, the United States was planning to export sixty millions of her unemployed and distribute them hither and yon among the populations of the helpless peoples with whom she traded. That fact is tragic, is it not? If under the system we were using, the United States felt she had to export enough goods to give sixty million unemployed a job, what can be said of Britain and Canada? What must their needs be? The United States is one of the most fortunate nations on the face of the earth. She is practically self-sufficient; she has over 130 millions of people; she has an industrial equipment second to none in the world; she has a transportation system adequate to the carrying to and fro of all her goods to her people; she has financial strength which