

From the Office of the Minister of Agriculture

TEXT OF A SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE
CANADIAN CLUB, ROYAL YORK HOTEL,
TORONTO, MARCH 13, 1967 AT 1:00 p.m.

THE HONOURABLE J.J. GREENE, MINISTER
CANADA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished head-table guest, gentlemen.

It is a great privilege for me to have the opportunity to address this distinguished group. There are those who may wonder at a rustic such as a Minister of Agriculture addressing a gathering of sophisticated businessmen such as this.

I can assure you there are Canadians in other part of this land who would not find it strange. They are very certain that the inhabitants of Bay Street are a species of farmers themselves. They are convinced, believe it or not, in some parts of Canada, that the Bay Streeters must be farmers because they have been "milking" the rest of Canada for years. They assure me you have been "plowing under" any economic opportunity and industrial development in other parts of Canada. They tell me you insist that the rest of Canada "lie fallow" while the fields of Bay Street be fertilized each year by a rich fertilizer composed of the mangled corpses from other parts of Canada perennially ravaged and plundered by you Bay Streeters.

As an Ex-Torontonian I cannot of course subscribe to this morbid theory of history. Having watched the ARGO's for the last decade, it is plain to me that Torontonians are the gentlest and least grasping and self-serving of Canadian souls.

But I do believe that the Canadian Club, and those engaged in public life, irrespective of the differences in their day-to-day pursuits, which may be as many poles apart as most of your vocations to that of being Minister of Agriculture, do have something in common.

I understand the main purpose of your organization is to foster things Canadian, to strengthen our country, to do what you can to make our Canadian future a better and a worthier one. Despite public cynicism to the contrary and despite the fact that accomplishment often fall far short of aspirations, I believe your objectives are shares most sincerely by the vast majority of persons in public life including politicians.

I have engaged in all avenues of political life from serving on town and county council to my present post. Contrary to popular belief, I have found that the vast majority of those engaged in these various branches of political service were sincerely dedicated to the service of their country and their fellowman, in the same terms and for the same objectives which your own Club would profess.

I recently came across a letter written by the late Dag Hammarskjold, who died in the service of mankind as Secretary-General of the United Nations, and I quote.....

"From generations of soldiers and government officials on my Father's side, I inherited a belief that no life was more satisfying than one of selfless service to your country ----or humanity".

I think most anyone who has been engaged in public life would subscribe to this thought.

On the Canadian scene in the past few years, we appear to have been engaging in introspection and soul-searching which at times appeared to be tearing apart the very structure of the nation. Instead of standing on the hilltop proudly waving the flag, we have found ourselves wracked and torn on a form of national psychiatrist's couch.

How often we in public life have longed nostalgically for the simpler day, the easier day. Those days when we looked back upon our past and our forebears with reverence. Those happy days when we clearly laid the bricks of today on the foundation of yesterday, and looked forward to completing the structure on the same design and according to the same plan.

It has often seemed that the turmoil of today decries all we have been, despairs at what we are, and has no idea what we are going to be. Our youth have "Looked Back in Anguish" and are looking ahead without knowing what to look for or in which direction to cast their eye.

Like many of you, I am sure, I have often been dismayed at what I saw and heard. What was so terrible about our past? What was so awful about what we had done and about what we had been? What are they kicking about? We had built here a way of life and a standard of living never before achieved. To those who lived, even as recently as 50 years ago, our accomplishments would have seemed as if the promised land.

True, there is still a great deal to be done, but do we have to tear down the whole house to build that new and sunny top-floor of the tomorrows?

Yes, I have often wondered and despaired and perhaps been a little frightened. My 17-year-old son assures me that it is an impenetrable "Generation Gap". Those of my hoary vintage will just never break through to see the faintest glimmer of the bright dream of the tomorrows. My 14-year-old daughter simply refers to our age as "the olden days".

At first I got my back up---and then I took a closer look. This is no Canadian phenomenon. This is a world revolution. In the last decade or two, the social, economic and political structure of mankind has changed more than in the whole prior course of mankind's sojourn upon this planet.

Whether we believe in "The Medium", "The Message" the new theology of McLuhanism or in the prophet himself, there is no doubt but that the communications of today are a power we could not previously have conceived. Every phenomenon, every personality, every event that occurs in any part of the globe is no longer something that we share vicariously or second-hand----- even the excruciating horror of war takes place as it occurred today or yesterday-----right in our own livingrooms and in the bosom of our own families.

It is obvious that the development of man as a social animal has not kept pace with his technological and electronic development. Hence the dilemma. The social scientist and the technocrat tell us that what we are seeing is the end of the technological revolution and the faint beginning of an electronic revolution which will make the changes of today and yesterday seem but a snail's pace.

This generation has only known a world of this pace. Little wonder that the ethics, the standards and the symbols of yesterday have but little meaning for them. Where does all this leave those whose function it is to lead -- to attempt to guide and direct and set the course over hitherto uncharted seas.

The responsibility of leadership rests on the popular will. Leaders sensible to the popular will have caught the spirit of the times --- the need for radical change. Who would have dreamed it possible but 30 or 40 years ago that the French, the German and the Italian people could in the 50's and 60's move in the direction of political unity in fulfilment of the agreement of the Treaty of Rome? Who would have foreseen the changes on our own continent? Those who still champion the recently sure-fire-winner doctrines of Col. McCormick --- "down with the British and up the Munro doctrine" are now known as the "nutty fringe". What seer could have found in his glass ball the Universal acceptance of the end of Colonialism and the emergence of new independence in Africa, and the Middle and Far East?

So the phenomenon of self-diagnosis, soul -searching and the wracking pain of the national psychiatrist's couch are not symptoms that belong uniquely to Canadians.

Two issues on the National front have particularly exercised us in the past few years. The first -- the spirit of change and rising independence in the Province of Quebec. More recently, the concern with American capital and control over our industrial and resource development.

It is of course difficult to see the direction and the extent of the forest of history when one is in the process of walking amid the trees. But I am presumptuous enough to believe that we are already a long way to solving what appeared to be that first crisis. Yes there is still a long way to go but I believe the Canadian Canoe has shot the worst of this particular rapid and is now on its way to calmer waters.

And now our preoccupation is with Question No.2-Foreign Control. Let me say at the outset that I don't belittle the problem. I have nothing but admiration for those who have focussed the National camera on the issue. It takes a great deal of courage in political life to boldly point out those things we would rather not see. Much easier to shove them under the rug in the traditional way of the politician. I think all of us have known for a long time that a substantial proportion of our prosperity and high standard of living was founded from the accumulated savings of the people across the border. I am sure we have silently wondered whether there wouldn't be a "day of reckoning". So long as the golden eggs kept coming we weren't going to look the horse in the mouth, if I may coin a Stengalese. Largely through the efforts and the courage and the tenacity of one man, the question is now no longer under the rug....it is now in the glare of the kleig-lights -----it can no longer be avoided.

I have no particular contribution to make to the discussion of this particular issue. But I do very much wonder whether we have delved sufficiently deep. I personally doubt whether foreign ownership or the French-Canadian question were the cause of our National ailment. If I were the National psychiatrist my diagnosis would be that these were symptoms -- not causes.

If we had a firm conviction as to what we wanted this young Canadian giant to grow up to be, there would be little trouble clearing up these minor maladies.

The real issue is that of a truly natural purpose and of our failure to crystallize that purpose. At first, carving out an existence in a tough and inexorable wilderness was national purpose enough. After Confederation the achieving of Canadian independence

and autonomy was our motivating purpose. The Statute of Westminster which fulfilled that purpose was passed but 35 years ago. Then there was a depression to be fought and a war to be won. And these challenges consumed our efforts and energy. And when the war was ended, there was the rehabilitation of our economy to peace-time purposes towards which we pulled as a people. Since that time there has perhaps been a hiatus in Canadian purpose.

It was perhaps not unnatural in a land so different and so differing in its regions and in its people, that we were not standing there at the ready with a National formula or philosophy to adapt to the dynamic era of the late 50's and 60's. We carried on our daily tasks, effectively and strenuously as Canadians are wont to do. Sometimes we but went where we were pushed. At times in our various regions and in our various interests, we pulled in opposite ways-----and so there was change and economic progress but we did not really know where we were going as a people or why we were going there.

This I believe is the real cause ---- the basic diagnosis. If we had a true National purpose accepted by Canadians it would not be difficult to remedy the individual maladies. If Canadians had a proud and sure and certain goal and foreign ownership was standing in the way of the achievement of that goal, Canadians would tighten their belts, divert more of their savings into equities, compel the insurance people to invest more of their funds in resource and industrial development or they would do whatever else needed to be done that we might proceed toward that goal of our national objectives.

You will say "Oh, that's all very well, but you cannot achieve such unanimity of purpose in a land like Canada". A fair indictment. Let me be specific as to national goals and objectives.

What of the financial structure on which our economic system is founded? Is it what it should be and all that we would have it? Is it such that our people can believe in it----give it their confidence and loyalty? Does it give a fair and equal shake to every investor, big or small? Does it afford equal opportunity for participation? Or is it a kind of "Cosy Capitalism"? Is it a game that gives a preference to those on the inside? Is it a game that by its structure restricts the good opportunities -- the likely winners to the group who are already there? Does the system provide a cosy way for the "inside trader", the "dividend stripper"? Does it permit fat pension plan preferences for the executive at the expense of the investor? Does the lions share of the "primary issue" go to the promoter rather than to development? Have we made the game unnecessarily complex so that the ordinary citizen just cannot play? Can we put every facet of it under the bright lights so that it can be truly said----This is a "people's capitalism"--- not a "cosy capitalism" or an "insiders capitalism".

President Eisenhower in 1950, while President of Columbia University, made a speech in which he records very simply and clearly the fundamentals of his belief. I quote -----

"The heritage of America and the Strength of America are expressed in three fundamental principles: First, individual freedom is our most precious possession; Second, all our freedoms are a single bundle, all must be secure if any is to be preserved; Third, freedom to compete and readiness to co-operate make our system the most productive on earth".

This is the direct philosophy of a great man who believed in the free private enterprise system. I, too, believe in that system. No other system conceived by man has so well brought forth the ability, the creativity and the ambition of the individual and thus impelled him to produce the most and the best.

No other system ever tried has matched the productivity of a private enterprise economy. The current tendency of those countries that have tried state control and direction of the organs of production to return to the incentive of individual enterprise bear clear witness to this fact. In the words of one of my Cabinet colleagues "If we are to have bigger shares, we must bake bigger pies". There is no question but that private enterprise has established that it does in fact bake the best and the biggest pies. If we are to have a better way of life for our people we must first have the best and biggest pies we can bake. Only free enterprise can bake them. In this day of rapid and effective communications, the bakery cannot be the exclusive and private shop of the few. I suggest it is the function of us all including government to make the game clean and understandable so that the system is something that all of our people can take pride in as being the best of all possible systems.

Rest assured that if we fail to make it so, those who believe in more statism and more state control will soon have the people with them. I am certain that the result would be as it has always been with the advent of statism ----small pies!

Those of you who are much more familiar with the intricacies of the financial game than I, will know whether we can learn something in this area from our American friends. Have they, through comprehensive S.E.C. regulations, anti-trust and anti-monopoly laws, strictly administered by tough officials and vigilant courts come closer to a true "peoples capitalism"? As a layman, I cannot but be impressed by the passionate loyalty of the mass of the American people to the private enterprise system, ---- by their apparent determination to make it a fair game.

I was disappointed to find that an American shareholder of a company whose assets were virtually all in Canada received information as to the remuneration paid to Directors and Executive, benefits and preferences such as pension plans and stock options given to insiders in the company while the Canadian shareholder in that Canadian resource was not entitled as his legal right to such information.

I am also impressed by what I understand to be the Galbraithian approach to the private enterprise system. If I read him correctly, he doesn't advocate more state control or more state enterprise. He speaks of diverting more of the fruits of the great productive capacity of private enterprise into the public sector --- schools, slum clearance, more livable cities --- those many areas where we have as yet failed to achieve social justice.

Is this an approach that we have sufficiently explored? Can it not be a motivation and direction of the Corporate structure of our economy to work not only toward corporate growth but as well to work towards greater contribution to the public sector?

I recall how the business and corporate leaders thought the New Deal was the end of private enterprise. I would suggest that the most fearful of them would today admit that the fairer distribution of wealth resulting from the New Deal gave greater opportunity than ever for the growth and expansion of their individual corporations.

Is there not here an area for the development of National purpose? To move from "Cosy Capitalism" to a true "Peoples Capitalism".

I think this is the financial way most Canadians would want if we but give them the opportunity to find it.

I don't want to single out the financial section of our society alone. What of the professional area? What of the legal game of which I know a little and which is an integral part of our society? Is this too, a cosy game?

I think it is human for all of us to play the game every day by the rules as we have found them. We are so busy making a living and practising our trade that we take little time for the improvement of that trade.

How many hours each week does the average lawyer spend in seeing to it that the laws are made better, more just? In seeing to it in Laurier's words "that justice is made more perfect"? How often are the laws used to delay, to obstruct, to prevent justice? We have seen of late that the Trade Unionists have held the law in contempt.

Some have been imprisoned for their beliefs. I agree that laws must be obeyed. We can press for change but not disobey the laws as they exist ---- otherwise order in our society disintegrates into chaos and anarchy.

But what is behind the dissatisfaction of the Trade Unionist. Is he any less worthy, or less desirous of order in our society than anyone else? Men like Samuel Gompers and Eugene Debs are among the very great men who have lived in this century. I doubt very much whether the labour leaders of today are any less worthy. But have they found a judicial forum where the issues affecting labour could be adjudicated justly, quickly and efficiently? Have they found administrative and legal procedures especially suited to the resolution of labour problems -- manned by officials, judicial and otherwise possessing special skills and experience in labour matters? Or have they found delays and obstructions? Have they been asked to use old tools geared to another era and largely formulated for the settlement of individual rather than collective disputes?

Have they found the interim injunction, the weapon of those with whom they have contended rather than a necessary means to assure order and the protection of property as it purports to be? Is there any reason why all the ingenuity of man could not find a method whereby rights of property could be protected without the long delay of the interim injunction, which virtually negates the working man's main weapon -- his right to collective action?

The right to legal aid is a bright sign on the horizon. But is the legal system also too cosy and too comfortable?

Have other areas of the professional world moved rapidly enough for today's world?

Would all of our professional societies put their game under the bright lights that the public might see that their particular game is fair and just; is as highly productive as possible in the interests of all our people?

I believe that in the area of the professional world too, we may do a great deal to move in directions which would give our people a sense of pride in the professional areas of our society and a certainty that the Canadian way in these spheres was the best possible way.

Another area where we have yet to make a decision as to the Canadian ideal. Our industrial and commercial development has largely taken place in a few huge and rapidly burgeoning metropolitan centres. I seek to take nothing away from our great cities. Urbanization is an essential fact of the 20th Century development. The question is one of degree.

Do we wish to follow the American pattern of a few huge urban-metropolitan complexes--- with a very low rural-urban ratio. Or, should Canada emphasize regional development and maintain a 15 or 20% rural-urban ratio which is something in the nature of the present picture.

Professor Paul Goodman, noted Sociologist author and poet recently delivered the Massey Lectures which dealt with the problem.

I quote from those lectures ---

"Urbanization is not a necessity of population growth... by 1990 75% of Americans will live in dense metropolitan areas. Even at present only about 6% are listed as rural...yet the cities already show signs of over-population. They don't provide adequate city services and probably cannot provide them. They are vulnerable to urban catastrophes that might destroy thousands; it is prohibitively costly to live decently in them; and, in my opinion, though this is hard to prove, the crowding is already more than is permissible for mental health and normal growing up. The urbanization is mainly due not to natural or social psychological causes, but to political policy and an economic style careless of social costs and even money costs.... in the United States though we collect the refugees in slums, we do not permit them to die of starvation or cholera.

.....It is painfully reminiscent of Imperial Rome, the return of the farmland to swamp and the flight of the optimati from the city centre. The central city is occupied by a stinking mob who can hardly be called citizens, and the periphery by the knights and senators who are no longer interested in being citizens..... In Harlem there are 67,000 people to the square mile; people live two and three to a room; and the average child of 12 will not have been half a mile from home..."

Professor Goodman enjoins Canadians as follows -----

"In Canada, a more rational judgement is possible. You have a rural ratio -----15-20% that we ought to envy. Your cities, though in need of improvement, are manageable in size. There is still a nodding acquaintance between city and country. I urge you not to proceed down our primrose path, but to keep the ratio you have, and, as your technology and population grow, to work out a better urban-rural symbiosis".

We have no national policy on the issue. Our growth has been willy-nilly. The decision as to the nature of our development has been made for us and not by us. The decisions were made by the Managers of our financial, industrial and commercial entities, for economic, rather than social purposes.

The trend towards the megalopolis will continue unless we have strong national views on the issue.

Here is a decision upon which we have a duty to focus our national thinking. Here again I suggest it is an area for positive Canadianhood and a way of life for Canadians which will be peculiarly our own.

And what of Canada's place on the international scene? Have we achieved a really meaningful objective in this area?

We have a great part to play.

We are feared by no one. They know that any help or direction we may give will never be tied to military purpose or purposes of power or self-aggrandisement. Are we doing enough?

We have, in considerable measure, accepted the philosophy of the egalitarian society in our own land. If Karl Marx had seen that we would put a bite of 52% on corporate profits he might never have written the book at all!

But do we apply the same philosophy of egalitarianism to the human family at large? We are still aspiring to the goal that sometime in the future 1% of our G.N.P. will go to External Aid. This is a long way indeed from international egalitarianism.

The population of the world will double before the turn of the century. It has taken all the eons of history to put 3 billion people on the face of this old globe. There will be another 3 billion in but 33 years.

The problem of feeding these new hosts is almost frightening in its enormity. I am very certain we have the most skillful and knowledgeable and productive farmers in the world. We have been blessed with unsurpassed agricultural resources, many of them yet untapped. We have the skill, knowhow and the expertise to give the other lands. We have as yet no truly great National plan as to what part we will play in this prime problem of our fellow-man in the next 2 or 3 decades. Think of the zeal and the zest with which our young people who are so zealously seeking human and national purpose would enter the fray if we did, in fact, have such a plan in which they might play a part. Here also I suggest is great scope for truly Canadian national purpose.

Then there is the attendant query, economic continentalism versus economic nationalism. Many have seen perils on both sides of the coin. Surely these are not the only alternatives. As early as 1963 New York Senator Jacob Javitts had suggested a full economic partnership with Britain when she failed to enter the Common Market. A recent letter to the London Times signed by some 77 prominent Americans representing a wide cross-section of American politicians and academics including Congressmen, State Governors and representing both parties has revived the issue. The letter has inaugurated a wide international discussion. Our own Prime Minister, even before Senator Javitts, had suggested the possibility of a form of Atlantic Economic Alliance.

I have found that some of the E.F.T.A. (the outer 7) countries are much concerned with the firming of the E.E.C. policies in agriculture which will restrict their entry into that European market.

It appears that in large measure the E.E.C. is a protective trading block. Canada's prime economic and industrial problem is that of too limited a market. A common market to be gradually evolved which would include ourselves, the U.S., Great Britain and the E.F.T.A. countries can but excite our imagination. Could Canadians compete effectively, agriculturally and industrially in such a market? Is this a possible way for our future? Surely this is an alternative to be positively explored? These are but a few areas in which I suggest there is scope and need for positive national action and purpose. I believe that if we move into these areas the negative questions, which have been troubling our Canadian soul, will be seen in their true perspective.

"Ah, but," you will say, "all these great projects will take some form of super leadership which is just not available today". I disagree. I believe we have competent, capable and dedicated leadership presently available and even more waiting in the wings. Too often I have heard of late that some form of magic or super-leadership was needed in Canada. Let us consider the leadership which has achieved the greatest changes of the fundamental kind I have envisaged in our current world. Harry Truman was lampooned by his belittlers as a "mid-western habadasher". History may well find he was one of the great Presidents. It was he who achieved what even the very great President Wilson was unable to accomplish. He brought the U.S. finally into the world community through the Marshall Plan and similar post-war measures. It was he who made the bold Korean decision which has been the very base of far East inter-relationships since. He too made the McArthur decision which may well have prevented a new global conflict.

Nikita Krushev was a Ukrainian herdsman. It was he who liberalized communist life which ultimately made possible the rapprochement between East and West which portends a happier relationship between the West and the Iron Curtain countries.

What of the man whose life and whose very short term of office will probably have more effect on the future than that of any super leader, statesman or soldier? ---- a poor peasant from Northern Italy, John the 23rd.

I don't believe it will take supermen to enable us to fashion these dreams of a great Canada on which can be founded these objectives and policies to which all Canadians will subscribe.

This, to me, is the real challenge in our land which we have not yet really begun to discuss. The positive ways in which we can build a truly Canadian entity which is meaningful to all our people -- which is shining and clean and bright--and will, to all our people, stand for a better future and a unique Canadian way of life.

I believe Canadians are yearning for just such a challenge. If we give our people these purposes and these objectives and these national goals I am convinced that the problems, if they be such, of our duality, of foreign investment, of our multi-racial and regional differences will but add strength to our fibre and to our purpose to achieve these goals and objectives and find at last our Canadian nationhood.

This I believe is the real and the fundamental Canadian challenge.