

time, this is clearly the controlling aspect of the matter. There are no grounds for any expenditure upon the navigation project in time of war and, as the considerations outlined above suggested, very slight grounds for doing anything more between Lake Ontario and Montreal under any conditions, whether of peace or of war. Indeed the suggestion is now being made in Washington that, even if the agreement is adopted, expenditures will be limited to those works necessary to the development of power until after the ending of the war.

That there is a great block of power available in the International section of the river is certain; but for war purposes it has very grave disadvantages. The minimum time required for its develop-

ment is four years. It is a less manageable development because of its very size than the nearest alternatives to it. It is difficult to get estimates of cost per horsepower for such other powers, but it seems certain that, on a cost basis, the St. Lawrence is certainly at no advantage over them and is, more probably, at a disadvantage. In any case, the deciding factor in a war economy is not cost but time, and there clearly the smaller streams have a very marked advantage.

Upon both counts, then, of navigation and of power, it has seemed impossible to find adequate reasons for proceeding with this project at the present time. Whether rational arguments are the only or even the chief ones to enter into the final decision is another matter.

Educating the Consumer in War-Time

By BERYL PLUMPTRE

EVER since war broke out in September 1939 the plea of Canadian housewives has been, "What can we do to help? Surely we can do something in our spare time to help crush Hitler!" Some housewives who are fortunate enough to have reliable domestic help so that they can leave their homes for several hours at a stretch have found war jobs with one or another of the many volunteer organizations. But those of us who must be on duty at home cannot always find satisfying and useful war jobs. Not every woman is content with knitting socks or sewing garments. We have been brought up in the days of mass production and we feel this method of manufacture somewhat irritating, and perhaps not the most economical. And so we have continued to ask "What can we do?"

A few months ago Canadian papers carried the news that the government had published through its Department of Agriculture a booklet for housewives

called *Foods for Home Defence*. This booklet aimed to teach the housewife how to buy food in war-time. But it was more than mere helpful hints for housewives. It was the government's first attempt to show to the housewife her real job in this war. Let us hope that before long more such publications will appear—publications which will not only try to guide our food purchases, but will help us with all our purchases, telling us what we should buy and what we should do without during the war.

It is perhaps somewhat disappointing that the government took so long to venture on its first step, and even more disappointing that its first step should be so hesitating and so limited and should not have been followed by another. *Foods for Home Defence* begins by listing War-time Foods, and briefly comments on the supply available to Canadians. For example it states briefly that Britain needs cheese, ham and bacon—Canadians can do without these things. No housewife will quarrel with that. Newspaper announcements have told us of these

EDITOR'S NOTE: Mrs. Beryl Plumptre, of Toronto, is a graduate of the London School of Economics.

British needs and we have tried to co-operate. But no attempt is made in this booklet to state the whole problem, as to how much of these goods is produced in Canada, how much is needed for Great Britain, and whether or not Britain wants all kinds of cheeses and all parts of the pig. Then, again, there is the statement: "Fruit juices—tomato, rhubarb, cranberry, apple and grape juices, Canadian grown—can replace citrus fruits." I quarrel with this statement on two points. First, can these fruit juices replace citrus fruits? Will my family get the same vitamins from a glass of apple juice as from a glass of fresh orange juice? And secondly, and perhaps even more important, will no one tell the housewife why she should not buy citrus fruits? Does the government think that the housewife is afraid to know that if she spends American dollars to buy citrus fruits, there may not be enough dollars left to buy equipment for our fighting forces, or machines for our factories to make armaments?

This negative approach reminds me of an incident which occurred several months ago. I asked the editor of an excellent woman's page in one of our daily papers what she was trying to do to help the housewife with her war job of spending her money so that her purchases will not hinder our war effort. "I do what I can," she replied. "For a while I left out all recipes calling for lemon juice, but the advertisers of citrus fruits threatened to withdraw their advertisements, so my publishers made me put such recipes in my page again."

So there we are, housewives, guinea pigs for advertisers, even to the extent of hindering our war effort. Of course, one might have hoped for more courage from our newspaper publishers. But perhaps they have been waiting for some signs from the government of an active policy of trying to teach the consumer what to buy. The lack of explanation to the housewife in this new booklet is indicative of the government's attitude to all consumers. And yet the public is willing and ready to co-operate—even

to the point of accepting regimentation—if it knows what is needed. But how many Canadians realise the full implications of this war, and how it must affect their private lives, even as to whether or not they should drink orange juice?

Some people may doubt this claim that Canadians will co-operate fully. They will point to the fact that Canadians have not yet reduced their inessential gasoline consumption by fifty per cent as requested by the government. Perhaps the response may have been a little disappointing. But is the citizen entirely to blame? I do not think so. I do not feel the case was put to him fairly and squarely. Every day from government advertisements in the press, from government posters, from appeals over the radio he learned that the fighting forces needed the gasoline he was using. Was that strictly true? Was not the problem more like this: Great Britain had access to supplies of oil, more than adequate for all her needs. But this oil had to be taken from the fields to points where it was needed. The enemy had sunk so many tankers, that the tankers which used to bring oil to Canada from U. S. A. had to take oil to Great Britain or to wherever her forces needed it. As the Canadian government had not any other equipment to bring oil to Canada, there was much less oil in Canada than usual. Then why did not the Canadian government say: We are going to ration the supply available in Canada so that each Canadian may share according to his or her needs? But instead the government resorted to the subterfuge of appeals to save gasoline for the fighting forces. It may be, of course, that the government had reasons unknown to the public for the adoption of this policy, and on this ground clear-thinking citizens might forgive the subterfuge and curtail their consumption of gasoline as requested. But co-operation is difficult when there are evidences that the government itself is not co-operating. For example, just a few days after the oil controller launched his appeal to save gasoline, all householders on my street received from the

Postmaster General pamphlets urging them to use the air-mail services for all their correspondence, both business and social. Increased air-mail would surely call for more planes and more gasoline.

These two instances, foodstuffs and gasoline, are, however, a very small part of the problem of Canadian consumers in war-time. Let me now turn to the problem as a whole. What should the war effort mean to the Canadian consumer?

When war broke out Canadian industries were, for the most part, working below capacity. Many men and resources which had become idle during the years of depression were still idle. Now, after more than two years of war, practically all these men are employed, and our factories are working to capacity. But Hitler is still undefeated. What must we do to win? We must give up our luxuries and non-essentials: instead of making these goods we must make more, many more munitions and much more war equipment. Canadians can no longer have their cake and beat Hitler. This is no new fact, but many Canadians still do not realize it. But the government realizes it, and for many months has been taking direct action to bring about this transfer of production from non-essentials to war requirements.

As far back as June 1940, the government imposed excise duties on Canadian manufactured automobiles. It hoped that, as a result of the higher prices, sales of automobiles would decline. But sales continued to rise, and in November 1940, the government took further action and prohibited for the duration of the war, the manufacture of new models of such articles as motor cars, radios, washing machines and typewriters.¹ The chief motive for this restriction was to conserve machine tools and to make available for war industries skilled and highly trained men. But at the same time

it effectively removed one of the most alluring baits of the salesman—the appeal of a new model. In the following month, the government increased still further the excise duties on automobiles. It also imposed similar duties on other durable consumer goods whose production competes, in labour and materials, with war industries. This group includes such articles as cameras, radios, electrical appliances, phonographs, slot machines, etc.

In other cases, the government has taken more direct action to reduce the purchases of this type of durable consumer goods. Instead of relying on higher prices to lessen the demand, the government has restricted the manufacture of these goods, so that fewer are available to the consumer. It has recently limited the number of automobiles, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, etc., which may be manufactured for sale to the public, and the supplies of metals for producing washing machines and other products. All essential commodities are by now under the jurisdiction of one or another of the government controllers or administrators, who, in conjunction with the government priorities officer, ensure that supplies of materials needed for war industries will only be available to producers of non-essential goods after war industries have received their full requirements.

It is unfortunate that much of the excellent work of transferring materials and labour from peace-time to war-time industries has been done without publicity by which the consumer could grasp the significance of the government's actions. The consumer has a vague knowledge that industrial changes are taking place. He or she knows that Canada is turning out large quantities of war equipment, but the stores still seem to have supplies of most Canadian things which they need, especially such things as radios, washing machines, electrical goods, etc. These goods are still widely advertised. The housewife especially sees these things, and she reasons something like this. She has more money in

(1) Recently the government has allowed some relaxation with regard to the manufacture of new models. Canadian manufacturers have claimed that it is more economical to produce new models similar to those produced in U. S. A., than to renew the production of old models.

her purse these days than, in many cases, she has had for years. She has wanted a washing machine for years. She realizes that prices have risen. That is a pity, but future prospects seem good, so why not buy while the money is there. Prices may not go higher, because of the new "ceiling," but they certainly will not go lower.

She does not realize the full significance of her decision. She does not understand that the manufacturer of war goods needs the metals which have gone into her machine: that he needs the services of the men who made it. She knows nothing of the fact that her purchase and the purchases of hundreds of other housewives are strengthening the pressure which manufacturers and the agents who sell these machines are putting on the government to be allowed to continue the manufacture of these goods. Nor does she appreciate or even realize the difficulties in which the government is involved in trying to shift production to war goods. Most consumers know that some manufacturers have switched easily from their peace-time products to war-time products. For example, some textile manufacturers who made civilian clothing are now making uniforms. But does the average consumer know of the difficulties involved in the transfer of labour and supplies from one industry to another? And what of the business connections which have often taken a lifetime to build up, and which are often completely broken by the war-time restrictions of the government.

But there is still another problem for the consumer. Do consumers realize when they buy a new washing machine or radio that their purchase is increasing the upward pressure on prices? Do they understand that their action complicates still further the government's problem of trying to keep prices from rising? The disorders in Europe during the period of inflation are perhaps the most vividly remembered of the economic consequences of the last war. For this reason fear of inflation looms large in the minds of many Canadians at the present time.

And the government has not ignored this fear. Even before Canada had declared war, the government established the Wartime Prices and Trade Board to provide safeguards against undue rises in the prices of the necessities of life. This Board has functioned actively, and in August 1941 its powers were extended to give it control over prices of all commodities. In October 1941 it was made responsible for giving effect to the general ceiling on prices announced by the government.

The government has also directed its financial policy towards lessening the pressure on the price level. Through the imposition of high taxes, and borrowing from the public, the government has tried to drain away from the public surplus funds which might be spent thoughtlessly on non-essentials. But in its publicity, the government has laid more emphasis on the fact that it needs money to pay for the war. Citizens have not been told often enough or strongly enough that it is even more important for them not to spend their money. Lending it to the government removes temptation to buy those extra things we can do without.

So far this article has dealt chiefly with problems concerning Canadian made goods. But the government has to teach its citizens that they should no longer buy imported goods indiscriminately. In December 1940, the government prohibited the importation of specific non-essential goods from non-sterling countries. These are, for the most part, goods which consumers could be legitimately expected to do without in war-time. Administrative and political difficulties make it inexpedient to extend this list of prohibited goods. But consumers, if they fully understood the nation's need for American dollars, would readily forgo non-essentials which are still coming in from the States.

More could probably be done, also, to persuade consumers to shift their purchases of imports to Empire goods wherever possible. Canadians are ready to share their food supplies with Great

Britain. It is not unreasonable to expect that, if they were aware of the situation, they would buy British goods rather than goods from other countries. Britain and the other Dominions are buying so heavily from Canada at present that their debts are mounting up. These countries are glad to be able to discharge these debts by selling their products to us.

Canadian consumers, however, cannot be expected to know of, let alone understand, all these problems unless more effort is made to inform them. From its financial and production policy, it is obvious that the government is aware of the importance of guiding consumption in war-time. But so far it has not given the consumers a chance to play their full part. Now that Canadian industry has entered the phase of so-called "full employment," these problems will grow more and more acute, and

the imposition of the price "ceiling" has increased the need for educating consumers. No longer will shortages be indicated by price movements.

Ignorance among consumers should surely be a matter of grave concern to the government. There is little doubt that Canadian industries can only continue to fill their ever-increasing war orders, if the government takes still further action to restrict the production of non-essentials. But Canadians will not demur at further government interference with the supply of their luxuries and non-essentials if they know such restriction is necessary for an all-out war effort. And surely the government will find willing co-operation from citizens more helpful than the uninformed criticism and dissatisfaction which so often surrounds the government's war policy.

Some Aspects of Agriculture in the Maritimes

By J. E. LATTIMER

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE

THE Maritime Provinces have an area just a trifle larger than England without Wales, with a population in 1931 of 1,009,103 that has increased to 1,120,486 in 1941. The total area of the region has slight relationship to the development of agriculture as only a small portion is improved farm land. In 1931 only about 30 per cent of the total 32 million acres was in occupied farms and only about 9 per cent of the total was improved farm land. Thus, in the Maritime Provinces there were only 2,901,698 acres or 2.9 acres per person of improved land, while in the Dominion as a whole there were about 86 million acres or 8.5 acres per person. Improved land comprises that which was plowed

or mown or might be mown with a machine, but does not include natural pasture. The 91 per cent which was unimproved land contained considerable natural pasture and some waste land but the bulk was in forest in some stage of development. These facts point to the importance of lumbering in the area but might lead to some surprise that it is a deficit area for many farm products.

Again it must be remembered that this picture applies only to the area as a whole. Within the area great variations exist. Prince Edward Island, as is well known, is the leading province of the Dominion in proportion of improved land to total. In that province in 1931, 85 per cent of the total area was in farms and of the area in farms, 61 per cent was improved. In Nova Scotia 32 per cent of the total area was in farms with 20 per cent improved. In New Brunswick 23 per cent of the total was in farms with 32 per cent improved.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Dr. Lattimer is Professor of Economics at Macdonald College, Ste. Anne de Bellevue. He has during the last summer, undertaken for the Dalhousie Institute of Public Affairs, an investigation of the effects which the war has so far had on agriculture in the Maritimes. The above article is an outgrowth of the work done for that purpose.