

I am not sure who "we" is.
 . . . that the world of to-morrow will not be identical with the pleasant and familiar scene which lay before our eyes in 1939.

I infer from this that he looks to see a world considerably different, a less pleasant place after the war than it was before. I remember during the last war they said that all we had to do was to hang the kaiser and we would have a world fit for heroes to live in. They did not actually hang the kaiser, but they put him out of business and all I can say is that the world was a much less happy place without the kaiser than it had been with him. According to Doctor James, the world is going to be a less pleasant place without Herr Hitler than it was with him. Those are the words of Doctor James, not mine.

According to his book, Sir William proposes to give £4 or \$20 for a birth, and £20 for a funeral. Apparently a person will be worth more dead than he is alive. Then Sir William says:

Freedom from idleness is far more important than freedom from want.

It will be seen that he has added a fifth freedom to the four freedoms, namely, freedom from idleness. Another distinguished member of the London school of economics is Professor Laski, who is professor of political history at the school. He is internationally known as a communist, and a few years ago he published an essay in the United States entitled "Recovery through Revolution", from which I quote as follows:

The communist hypothesis . . . insists that no socialist government can attempt seriously to put its principles into practice without encountering determined resistance which will issue in civil war. To maintain socialist principles, in short, socialists will be driven to become communists or to betray their socialism. If they become communists they will find themselves involved in the grim logic of Leninism—the dictatorship of the proletariat, the drastic suppression of counter-revolution, the confiscation of the essential instruments of production, the building of the state, in a word, upon the principles of martial law until the security of the new order is firmly established. The transformation of capitalism into socialism means revolution, and that implies an experience akin to that through which Russia has passed.

Well, we are going half-way to Russia.

The fundamental idea of social insurance is really nothing but compulsory saving. And is not compulsory saving the very remedy adopted by the government at the present time to kill effective demand, or, in other words, to kill prosperity? I am not complaining of that. I believe that the present government is making a very successful and

praiseworthy effort in preventing any kind of inflation and in keeping prices down. But my point is this, that one of the main ways of doing it is through compulsory saving. Taxation is, of course, really compulsory saving. The main idea that underlies the Beveridge report is compulsory saving, and does it not stand to reason that it will have the same effect after the war that compulsory saving has during the war, namely, to kill prosperity?

Again, the Beveridge scheme, as I understand it, does not come into full effect for twenty-five years. If there is any merit in the scheme, why wait for twenty-five years? What are they waiting for? I understand that they have to wait until they have accumulated a sufficient fund before they can say: Now we can pay it out to one another. In reality they do not propose to save anything. They do not save any food, they do not save any clothes or anything of that kind. They are simply saving figures. You cannot eat figures; you cannot wear them. Suppose that when the war started this government had said, Sure, we must provide so many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of munitions of all kinds, but we cannot go to work on that yet because it will take us twenty-five years to accumulate the necessary funds, the figures. The same argument holds. If it is a good idea, why should we wait twenty-five years to put it into effect? Why not put it into effect immediately? Why not give assistance at once to those who are unemployed and those who are sick and need pensions or relief of any kind? If we did that, it would provide a great deal of employment for those who will need it.

At the present time, as one of my colleagues reminds me, we are paying the Germans every year a dividend of so many billions of dollars, amounting to well over half our national production, and we do not get anything in exchange for it. In fact, that is the last thing we want. We make a present of the whole thing to the enemy. I remember: when members of the house and people outside used to laugh at the social credit idea of paying ourselves a dividend. The thing appeared fantastic to them. Where would you get the money, they asked? It would be impossible, they said. But now we are doing it; only we are paying the dividend to the axis powers, a dividend that amounts to billions of dollars a year, and it seems to me that we are extremely prosperous while we are doing it. We are so prosperous that I imagine the main headache of the government is to kill that prosperity. Can one imagine what our prosperity would have been if, instead of making a present of all this wealth