

WELFARE FIFTY YEARS HENCE

MORRIS C. SHUMIATCHER*

Regina

I. *The Profession of Prophecy.*

I always believed the prophet of old testament times to be an electric kind of man plugged into a divine reservoir of energy that generated the thunder by which he castigated the morality of his contemporaries and produced the flashes of lightning that revealed the shape of the world to be. His was a role that found inspiration on high mountain peaks and pursued its meditation in green pastures. Whilst he turned inward to understand the nature of man, he reached upward and outward to discover some divine direction and to clothe it with a vocabulary. The prophet's concern was not to justify the ways of God to man, but to reveal them. If the process of deduction played a part in his predictions, this he never revealed. His vision of the future emerged full-blown. It found expression in authoritative dicta and exhortation to action. His methods would today be rejected as unscientific and totally unreliable.

Mathematics has made the difference.

In 1973, no self-respecting forecaster, whether of economic trends, national elections, population changes, educational establishments, budgetary requirements or any other social phenomenon would venture forth without his burgeoning bag of statistical data. During the past fifty years man has become so preoccupied with counting, it is not surprising that statistics should have taken on the same omniscient qualities that once emerged from the herb-pouches of the medicine man, the incantations of the witch doctor and the imprecations of the high priest.

Men have always been fascinated by numbers. The Cabbala once bore the same hallmarks of divine authority to the Hebrews that the augury of flying birds communicated to the Romans. The magic of numbers and their recurrences were remarked by Lavoisier, that ebullient French mathematician who lost his fortune at the gaming tables and his head to Robespierre's guillotine, but before doing so, inaugurated the statistical age. The era of the com-

* Morris C. Shumiatcher, Q.C., of the Bars of Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

puter, which began only a score of years ago, has come to produce data banks so vast in their store of facts and figures touching man and his world, in a spectrum so broad that they now claim to record the whole of contemporary history. As a result, these statistical treasure houses are producing virtually the only currency that appears to support the burgeoning business of prophecy. Revelation seems now confined to programming the punchcard systems, the regurgitations of which spew out data that rearrange established facts in new and novel forms, but in no way augment them. They re-state principles that have found human expression, but they create few new ideas.

With these data, forecasting the future ostensibly becomes a simple exercise. Past experience mathematically measured out as to quantum and time, is pin-pointed upon a two-dimensional chart. A line is drawn from point to point fixed by a scale graded upon a daily or annual basis, and changes are graphically illustrated by the movement of the line, upward or down, zig-zag or straight, in relation to time and other factors deemed relevant at the commencement of the exercise. The future is then projected by extending the line as many days or years ahead as there are data for the days or the years past. The future thus becomes an extended or attenuated replica of the past. The lines that have charted the past shape the trends of the future on the premise of the writer of *Ecclesiastes* who proclaimed that there is really nothing new under the sun.

While computerized statistical forecasting is currently regarded as a useful scientific exercise, and accordingly has grown influential among almost all decision-makers, in my view it is of no more scientific value than teacup reading or crystal ball gazing. Statistical forecasts are misleading and may even be mischievous for several reasons.

Statistical prophecy is based on the theory of the continuity of a selected number of perceived conditions. My health was good last week; it is good today. Therefore it may be forecast with reasonable certainty that it will be good next week. The projection of the past into the future in order to foretell the unknown may be a reasonable technique on a short-term basis. It is worthless when applied into the more distant future. The fact that I was in good health last week and am in good health today can be of little value in forecasting the state of my health thirty, forty or fifty years hence. In effect, therefore, forecasts of any condition or circumstance cast fifty years into the future generally are based on nothing more than a knowledge of a limited number of facts that existed in the past, that are considered to be of significance today, but that may or may not have relevancy tomorrow. Such prophecy can take no cognizance of present facts or of future circumstances unknown

to the contemporary collector of data that may be of great significance. The statistician's business, by definition, is a pedestrian one. He is powerless to consider or inject into his factual bank the innovations that are bound to be generated by minds more imaginative than his, and that will emerge and change the world in the years for which he is drawing his graphic forecasts.

A statistician in the year 1900, preparing his data on the occupations of those who would be gainfully employed in the year 1950 could not possibly be expected to take account of the rise and phenomenal growth of the automobile industry that transformed the economics of the whole of the western world in the brief span of fifty years. The economist in 1920, seeking to project gross national product figures for 1970, could not envisage the emergence of the television industry with its impact, not only upon the fields of manufacturing and finance, but upon the processes of marketing every consumable commodity and of communicating almost every conceivable idea and impulse. These were brought about without so much as a nod to the economic and sociological theoreticians who were only spectators at the virtuoso performances of the scientific and industrial innovators of our age. Extended beyond a minuscule measure in time, the statistical prophecy may be nothing more than a blind leap from the irrelevant into the improbable.

While some guessing games are frankly acknowledged to be based on conjecture, and thus may be as innocuous as they are entertaining, statistical economic forecasting is not of this benign genus. Claiming as it does, to be based on scientific methods, such prognostications assume the aura of authority. When widely published in learned and popular journals, the forecast becomes an authoritative map or master plan of the future. It ceases to be an opinion of the future condition of human society, but assumes instead the mantle of infallibility. In areas in which human values and motivations are a governing concern—the choices that are made in learning, in family relations, employment and the use and consumption of goods—the prophet who relies on past experience to delineate future trends may well prove to be accurate provided his prophecy is sufficiently widely published. Such prognosticating becomes a kind of national advertising. Given sufficient exposure, his prophecies, bizarre though they may be, stand a good chance of influencing the public to make the very choices he has claimed to be inevitable according to his statistical charts. This, then becomes the stuff out of which a self-fulfilling prophecy is made.

II. *The Escalative View of Welfare.*

If, in the fields of public health, education and welfare we were

to assume that the trends of the past fifty years are bound to continue, it would not be difficult to forecast the direction in which Canadian law in this field will grow. The statisticians clearly point the way.

Since Lord Beveridge drew his blueprint of the welfare state for Britain, it has become almost axiomatic in all western countries, including Canada, that governments will each year come to perform new functions that traditionally had been regarded as the responsibility of the individual. Public support of elementary and high schools for the universal education of children exploded at one end, into the operation of kindergartens, nurseries and day-care centres for toddlers, and at the other, into highly subsidized colleges and universities for tipplers. The public health services that traditionally fell under the aegis of government, such as the supply of pure water, the disposition of waste and the prevention of communicable diseases came to embrace not only the treatment of the physical ailments of individuals, but of their psychical and psychological problems as well. A humane concern for those genuinely unable to maintain themselves because of old age or physical or mental incapacity expanded into a great pink cloud of national mother love that drew to the lactescent bosom of the state everyone who wanted love or succour. All who felt poor were invited to partake. Eligibility was not to be based upon objective privation or need, but upon the degree of comparative affluence enjoyed by a claimant in relation to that of other members of the society in which he lived. In the result, "welfare" was equated to a concept of egalitarianism. Personal need became subordinated to a political creed. Welfare became more preoccupied with the distribution of income than with the alleviation of pain and distress. Penalizing the energetic and productive by means of taxation became as important a feature of welfare policy as the relief of genuine distress.

Fiscal policies became of prime significance.

Over the ten-year period between 1961-1962 and 1971-1972, the expenditures of all of the Canadian provinces on education, health and social welfare increased from \$2.244 billions to \$10.540 billions, approximately 375%. During the same ten-year period, municipal expenditures for these purposes rose 538% from \$1.0195 billions to \$6.509 billions.¹ This was only a reflection of the yet more stunning public expenditures for all purposes during the twenty-year period between 1950 and 1970. Spending skyrocketed from \$4.080 billions to \$29.967 billions—an increase of 634%.²

¹ Canadian Tax Foundation, Tax Memo, No. 35, July 1972, Tables 13 and 14, pp. 26-27.

² Canadian Tax Foundation, The National Finances, 1971-1972, Table 1, p. 12.

It is true that Canada's gross national product rose over these two decades. But the increase in productivity between 1950 and 1970 was only 165% calculated at market prices and the increase in gross national product was only 372%, so that the governments' take in the form of taxes rose at almost twice the rate at which the Canadian taxpayers' income allowed them to give.³

In the result, the share of the national gross product that remained for the citizen (private and corporate) to use and control and spend as he or it chose, declined over this twenty-year period from 77.2% to 64.5%, a shift of 12.7%. In the preceding twenty years (from 1929 to 1950) the percentage of the national gross product that citizens retained after taxes, declined at half that rate, from 83.9% to 77.3%, a total of 6.6%.

If the trend of the past forty years is to be projected into the future and the appetite of the state is to continue to grow unabated, it can be predicted that governments will take from the general public through taxation, a proportion of the gross national product that will diminish the fraction of the wealth retained by the citizens who produce it, by one-half over each and every twenty-year period. By 1990 an additional 27.6% will be taken by taxation. This will reduce the proportion retained by the citizen to about 36.9%. By 2010, the process will have the effect of completely wiping out the individual's right to retain any income or to dispose of any of his earnings as he wishes. All of it will belong to the state.

The possibility that governments will declare that because *they* provide for the citizen, there no longer exists the need for anyone to have or to keep any earnings, is not so far-fetched as today might appear. Already, there is a plethora of popular political propaganda expressing such policies. Statistical data such as I have mentioned can be cited to support it. Extended into the future, this policy will produce laws that will continue to shift responsibility from the individual and the "nuclear family", to government agencies functioning at higher and more remote levels. The law will be concerned with a further retreat of the family from its traditional role under which parents accept responsibility for their children's maintenance and education. The assumption of that role by public functionaries will promise parents the paradise of the fullest freedom for pleasure as governments accept the mundane burdens of the family, especially for those members who are young and old, uneducated and subnormal, sick and maladjusted and criminal; and they will take more of the individual's money and wealth to discharge those responsibilities. For these purposes there will be struck, principally by Parliament, budgets of astronomical proportions that will be followed by overwhelming claims staked

³ *Ibid.*, Tables 1-6, p. 7.

by governments at all levels, to the wealth of its citizen in the form of new and heavier taxes. Each levy will be justified by the logic that someone, of necessity, must assume responsibility for the individual citizen's welfare, and especially for those whose physical or mental capacities render them incapable of caring for themselves. As a result, the concept of individual responsibility will decline as the state expands its role as principal support of the family. In the end, the capacity of the individual to sustain himself is likely to correspondingly atrophy with disuse and so the ranks of the physical and mental cripples whom the state will be compelled to maintain will grow.

The principle of egalitarianism will be applied to the standard of life and this will guarantee that no individual's income will be either too large or too small, according to an arbitrary yardstick. Since the citizen's health will be underwritten by the state, it will follow that he will be the subject of a legal code designed to regulate diet, to compel participation in healthful exercise, to enforce wholesome sleeping habits, and, since *mens sana in corpore sano*, to monitor and guide his mental processes. To assure acceptance of all of these and other similar social policies, all significant conditioning and educational procedures will be carried out by government personnel in public institutions and not in the home. Given the present predilection of governments to assume the citizens' personal responsibilities, and the resultant willingness of a growing body of citizens to vacate those responsibilities, the result will be a system of wardship under which governments will assume the role of national guardians over a citizenry maintained in a permanent condition of innocent juvenescence.

Governments have not been the only authority to relieve the citizen of the task of deciding how his earnings should be spent. It is now commonplace for trade union agreements to assume this responsibility for those whom they represent. More important than high pay rates are a glittering assortment of fringe benefits. These include contributions to welfare funds, savings for vacations, payments to the establishment and maintenance of union holiday resorts, the provision of recreational facilities by management, the payment of premiums for employees' life insurance and other benefits (many of them non-taxable in the hands of the employee) for the protection and comfort of himself and his family. An increasing portion of pay is delivered to employees in forms other than cash.

These fringe benefits are generously supplemented by those of the state: statutory paid holidays, family allowances, unemployment insurance, hospitalization services, medicare, vacations with pay. All of these are real and substantial costs of production borne by the employer and ultimately passed on by him to the consuming public.

While these fringe benefits are welcome, there is not an employee so imperceptive that he fails to recognize the steady shrinkage of his pay cheque. It is not surprising that he should feel frustrated. He recognizes that what he earns is no longer his; that he has lost control over his affairs; that his major expenditures are now being paid out of his pockets by organizations of employers, by unions and (most significant of all) by the state. So immense is their power and so obscure their seat of control, that the influence that any individual finds he can bring to bear upon their policies is minuscule.

As the state and other dominant institutions exercise their growing authority over the citizen, his own capacity to make future choices diminishes. Whilst the objects of institutional direction and control are undoubtedly initiated out of the most benign motives of creating a secure and egalitarian society, they ultimately succeed only to the extent that the citizen becomes "cabined, cribbed, confined". The paradox is that the benevolent quest for security and egalitarianism leads to a custodial society of unrelieved monotony that must corral the creative, hobble the energetic and devour the dissident if it is to achieve its ends.

A projection of present trends therefore, will lead us not to a new society. Rather it will return us to a society in which the elements of status are of greater importance than the constituents of freely negotiated relationships, particularly those of contract. The senior citizen, the pensioner, the deserted wife, the dependent mother, the injured workman, the university student, the day-care-centre-charge, the treaty Indian, the "in-scope-employee", the bilingual public service employee, the uni-lingual civil servant, the prisoner, the parolee—each must be accorded his special status in a structured society that has already grown as rigid as the hierarchies of the feudal system of the thirteenth century. Lords and nobles, knights and serfs each in his place, performed his duties to, and claimed his rights from the authority that stood immediately above him in the feudal pecking order. What each man did was not so important as the status he occupied in the hierarchy. And while no social security numbers were then issued by the Sovereign, the place of every citizen and what he was entitled to claim of the society of which he was a part, were matters as precisely defined in the feudal age as they are now under the Social Security Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Canada Pension Plan and the federal and provincial welfare statutes. Under the feudal system, so long as he faithfully conformed, the individual was assured that his master would provide him with all of the necessities for life. He required no means by which to make choices on his own. He was paid no money-wages; he did not, and indeed, could not choose where he would work or where he would spend his earn-

ings. Why should he? Did he not have complete security? So it may be expected that, present trends continuing, within fifty years, the individual will return to a neo-feudal status of total security.

But it is my view that man's growth and development do not proceed in straight or even curved one-dimensional lines. Neither do quantitative data of past events necessarily reveal the course of human conduct of the future. Graphs that may demonstrate the growth of population in the past fifty years do not necessarily chart the trend for the next fifty years. In the 1920's, some population experts predicted that by 1970, Canada's French-speaking population would constitute a majority since the birthrate of French-Canadian Roman Catholic families far exceeded that of all other groups in Canada. The emergence of French-speaking Roman Catholics as the predominant racial linguistic and religious group in Canada was bound to shape the culture and mores of Canada in the last quarter of the twentieth century. So ran the popular theory that came to be referred to as "the revenge of the cradle" for the Plains of Abraham. It was a prophecy buttressed with solid statistical graphs projected fifty years into the future. These lines went a long way to nurture the nationalistic aspirations of many who foresaw as inevitable, a French-speaking Canada. Obviously, the statistical experts of fifty years ago lacked both the facts and the imagination necessary to build into their projections the decline in influence of the church or the effects of the pill. These played a vital role in reversing the population trends that the statisticians thought to be inevitable. Smaller families among French-speaking Canadians, the post-war baby boom and immigration all had the effect of reducing the proportionate growth of French-speaking Canadians, and when these facts became apparent, many no longer were willing to rely on the cradle to intensify their influence and turned to other means.

Thus, in human affairs, the theory that if a trend be recognized, it is likely to continue, does not provide an accurate basis on which to forecast the future. It is the unexpected and the unforeseen that are likely to become the most significant factors for change. Surprise makes fools of statistics.

III. *Human Affairs Are A Pendulum.*

If some theory is to be applied in considering the state of the law pertaining to health, welfare and education fifty years hence, experience would seem to favour the pendulum principle that views, human tastes and choices, institutions and standards of conduct as constantly changing and as periodically oscillating between extremes over periods of years or even centuries.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the changing fashions

of physical adornment and personal morality. The contemporary cultivation of long hair and hirsute facial embellishment is a re-run of the preferences demonstrated by royalist cavaliers of the court of the Stuarts. Our moral permissiveness is in the tradition of a licentious England in the years of the Restoration when the pendulum swiftly swung against the bleak years dominated by Cromwell's round-headed republicans. The libertarian society dominated by Edward VII was a moral and sartorial reaction against the strictures attempted by a widowed Victoria upon the ebullience of her vigorous people. The ethical self-reproach following World War I produced a pendulum-like swing from a free-wheeling morality on the one hand, to so prolific a proclamation of blue laws on the other, as to spawn a whole generation accused of being moral malefactors. Literature, liquor and libido all had their lynchers. It was some forty years before the pendulum of public opinion swung. New standards of morality were so swiftly incorporated into the law in the 1960's that some complained that society abandoned all but the barest elements of decency. Whatever one's tastes, it is common ground that trends in sartorial and moral standards have always moved pendulum fashion. It is my view that man's health, welfare and education, being as uniquely personal to him as his clothing and his morals, are likely to be subject to the same kind of swings. History is replete with evidence of the reversal of apparent trends. The concept of contract was the pivot upon which the feudal system's most stable concept—that of status—was reversed. As a result of that reversal, there developed a relatively free and mobile society.

The trends of the past fifty years have repudiated the concept of the free market place. The production and marketing of all major agricultural commodities are regulated by the state; the flow of commerce across international boundaries is controlled by law; private land purchases in some jurisdictions must be approved by a cabinet; the direct sale of commodities, from encyclopaedias to kitchen utensils, are subject to repudiation during a "cooling off period"; employment agreements are spelled out in statutes that accord special status to those who work; the practice of the learned professions is made subject to state controls; the press itself is regulated by government councils. The pendulum of such a society has indeed moved to an extreme position in its oscillations between freedom and servility, contract and status, independence and paternalism. And over the whole scene there floats, like some giant satellite, the theory that the state has eminent domain over all life and property. Upon that theory it claims and collects taxes at rates that would cause the most callous feudal lord to blush.

A reaction against this relationship between the state and the individual is inevitable.

The present position of Canada's economic and social pendulum has reached the point of a status-structured society from which the common sense of citizens will retreat when the implications of their status are recognized and the tribute they pay is assessed.

The trends that have produced the total state will be arrested and reversed when it is recognized that governments, grown greedy for money and power, debilitate and destroy the industry that is the source of a nation's wealth. Legislatures grown hyperactive produce citizens who are inactive and unproductive.

The major controls of the future, therefore, will not be imposed by public laws. They will become the restraints that individuals will exercise over their own desires and appetites, accepting the concept of Ortega y Gasset that:

Order is not a pressure imposed upon society from without, but an equilibrium which is set up from within.⁴

The society of the future will be one in which men themselves will fashion the relationships that are expected to satisfy their needs. The sanctions of the state will be resorted to only in the most exceptional cases.

Fifty years hence, men will agree that fewer laws be passed and that fewer sanctions be imposed by the state. Governments will be moved to disengage and leave the individual free to develop a higher degree of self-discipline. Parliamentarians will take pride not in the number of new statutes they will have passed in any year, but in the number of laws they have succeeded in repealing. They will come to embrace the view of the ancient philosopher Chuang Tze who said:⁵

There has been such a thing as letting mankind alone; there has never been such a thing as governing mankind. Letting alone springs from fear lest men's natural disposition be perverted and their virtue laid aside. But if their natural dispositions be not perverted nor their virtue laid aside, what room is there left for government?

This insight will be widely accepted when the sanguine promises of politicians concerning the magic of the laws they propose will prove illusory. Individuals will then come to exercise their own capacities and energies to support themselves and discover their own destinies, and they will exercise their own judgment to restrain themselves and consider their neighbours.

The concept of egalitarianism will also be rejected. The ethnic and cultural differences that became recognizable during the latter

⁴ Mirabeau o el politico in *Obras completas* (1947), Vol. III, p. 603.

⁵ James Legge (trans.), *The Writings of Kwang-zze, The Great Learning*, in *The Chinese Classics*, vol. I (2nd ed., 1893), pp. 355-381.

part of the twentieth century arose as a counter poise against the rising Canadian nationalism that was reflected not only in the country's economic and cultural activities but in the declarations of almost all political personalities. So in the twenty-first century, individual differences which are the hallmark of the human personality, will be accentuated as a pendulum-like reaction against the collectivist social policies of the age. Equality of opportunity will remain a cornerstone of national policy. But the concept that all individuals are equal will be rejected as unrealistic and retrograde. Unrealistic, because in whatever he does each man is unique and his personality differs from that of every other man. Retrogressive, because equality repudiates the concept of excellence upon which a meaningful life and a good society both depend.

The welfare state will not succeed in changing the basic nature and motivation of mankind. Men will remain self-interested though not necessarily self-centred. They will continue to be competitive whenever they are free to exercise their will to succeed and to excel. The pious policies of planners who will design a state in which there are no losers and only winners, will fail. To believe that fifty years hence, some national *pater familias* will produce a condition of security and egalitarianism in which there will be defused man's instinct to strive to distinguish himself above his fellows, whether in the laboratory or in the boxing ring, in the concert hall or on the ice, in the marketplace or in the court room—is as unrealistic as a painted picture on a stage back-drop.

Of course, it may be that the pendulum has not yet swung to the extreme, and there will be more laws controlling the lives of Canadians before there are less.

IV. *Schools of the Future.*

Dissatisfaction with large school districts, elaborate institutions and mass production within the schools will become almost universal in the latter part of the century.

The purpose of establishing large schools and larger school units was to equalize the opportunities for a good education among all children wherever they might live. The little red schoolhouse, it was believed, could not provide the variety of courses available to students in the cities. To more equitably distribute the material resources considered essential for a good education, it was believed that the larger the school unit the greater the opportunities for children to acquire the skills that would assure their economic success after graduation. It was also believed that the economies of large-scale industry had equal validity to the production of well-equipped high-school and university graduates. Thus, the process of expansion was pursued with unflagging zeal by two generations

in the mid-twentieth century. But all found it to be wanting. It not only failed to save money; it resulted in such lavish spending that the costs of education increased to crisis proportions. It was admitted, ultimately, that never had so many billions in money been spent to produce so much mediocrity.

It also became recognized that large schools and elaborate transport facilities designed to move students from outlying areas to centres in which expensive plants had been constructed did not improve the quality of teaching or the extent of learning. The most important element in the learning equation—the human relationship between teacher and student—was found to decline and to virtually disappear as schools grew larger and more impersonal. With the emphasis upon organization, size and system, the process of learning failed utterly. Students were found to have grown solitary and alienated, and the school itself became an environment so foreign that it lost the capacity to stimulate children to anything save escape.

While it was believed that egalitarianism in education would result in greater economic equality of the population, it was found that this, in fact, was not the case.⁶ On the contrary, it came to be recognized that poverty is a condition of relative, rather than absolute privation; that people who feel poor are poor. They feel poor if they have less than their neighbours and this is true regardless of their absolute income. It was also found that making schools more equal does not help very much in equalizing opportunities for economic success; that schools do not contribute significantly to adult equality because poverty is not primarily hereditary. Whilst children born into poverty were found to have a higher likelihood of ending up poor, there is still an enormous amount of economic mobility from one generation to the next. The father whose occupation is low paid does not necessarily pass that disadvantage on. Similarly, a father whose occupation is high paid has an even harder time passing the advantage on to his children. And while the effects of economic status upon sons is small, upon daughters, it is minuscule.

It also came to be recognized that while ability to read and articulate, to recognize and solve problems successfully at school has a real relationship to success in a career, equalizing all schools does not reduce the cognitive inequalities that exist among students themselves.

The simple reasons for this finally came to be known. Children are more influenced by what happens at home than by what hap-

⁶ Christopher Jenks et al., *Inequality: Re-Assessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*, Educational Policy Research Centre, Harvard University (1972).

pens at school. Administrators have little control over those aspects of school life that truly affect children. Re-allocating resources or consolidating school districts or moving students from one area to another seldom change the way children and teachers interact.

The principle that was finally accepted in the latter part of the twentieth century was that:

People who start off equal end up almost as unequal as anyone else. Inequality is not mostly inherited; it is recreated anew in each generation.⁷

The school fifty years hence, will *first*, re-affirm the fact that the responsibility for teaching the young is primarily that of parents, that professional teachers, trustees and governments can act only as the surrogates of parents whose preferences should govern in the establishment of the classroom, its place and atmosphere. The home will be the best classroom of all; and when the processes of education move beyond the home, the school in the community in which the child feels most at home will become the best classroom.

Secondly, since the idea that professional educators know appreciably more than parents about what is good for children, parents will decide what kind of education their children should have while they are young. Where they cannot themselves carry out the duty of educating their children, they will, to an ever-increasing extent, establish and operate their own schools. For this purpose parents will, whenever possible, use their own resources. Where these are insufficient, they will be entitled to claim from the taxing authorities (municipal, provincial or federal, or both) a sum equivalent to the cost of educating their children in a publicly-financed school, and of applying this money to the support of a privately operated school in which their children are enrolled. The teachers of these schools will be appointed and paid by the parents directly.

Thirdly, since the "output" of a school will be found to depend upon the "input", the characteristics of each child will become of more importance than government-prescribed curricula, public school policies and even the characteristics of teachers. Parents have the best opportunity to learn and understand the character and needs of the child. It will therefore become their duty to work with the teacher to develop the latent talents of their child.

Finally, the school will be a pleasant place where the child can learn and acquire knowledge for its own sake. It will not, however, be represented as a fun place where all things are made easy. On the contrary, it will be found that the acquisition of all knowledge

⁷ *Ibid.*

requires effort, but that that effort will be worthwhile, because, as Cicero put it:⁸

... we are all of us drawn to the pursuit of knowledge; in which to excel, we consider excellent, whereas to mistake, to err, to be ignorant, to be deceived, is both an evil and a disgrace.

V. *Health Services of the Future.*

In keeping with the slogan of the World Health Organization that "health is the ultimate good of mankind", the next fifty years will witness a metamorphosis in the relationship between a doctor and his patient. Traditionally, the doctor made himself available to those who came to him voluntarily seeking his help, and the relationship was based on a highly personal contract for service, express or implied, in which the physician's principal duty was to his patient. With the new comprehensive type of medicine promoted by public officials, politicians will continue to promise to everyone who ever was, is or in future may become sick, that he has an inalienable "right to health". Everyone's health will be underwritten by the government by emphasizing preventive care. Thus, doctors will be swept into a programme of "social action" and expected to deliver the goods that will be promised by those who can themselves deliver nothing. This, it will be impossible to do. But it will produce a corollary. It will be required that all persons submit to compulsory examinations, for without these no preventive programme of medicine is possible. The doctor, traditionally pledged to secrecy, will no longer continue as the confidential advisor to his patient since he will be required to submit reports to the public health controller whose policies will come to be determined, not by an individual's needs, but by statistics and the overriding policies of the state.

Next, it will be claimed that physical health necessitates preventive mental health. It will then be a simple matter for the public health controller to stipulate that the thinking of healthy thoughts is a prerequisite to the enjoyment of a healthy life. Thought control will become an essential part of the advanced government's social health programme. The computerized reports that the medical profession will make to the health controller concerning each of his patients will serve as a useful basis for appropriate thought therapy, and possibly for the taking of appropriate social or political measures where a patient appears resistant to the official norms.

As the national medical-mental social action programme converts the personal patient-doctor relationship into an official encounter between the citizen and agents of the state, sensitive

⁸ H. Rackman (trans.), Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, Book V, Loeb Classical Library (1931).

individuals will eschew the offices of those physicians and surgeons who have become a part of the medical bureaucracy. Since legislation will require that all medical personnel practice within the programme, those desiring personal, confidential advice and treatment will be able to resort only to the relatively few unauthorized, unlicensed practitioners who will bootleg their services at the risk of prosecution and heavy penalties to themselves and their patients.

Many, unwilling to risk penalties for trafficking with unlicensed doctors will resort to quacks outside the medical profession. Hypnotists, magicians, necromancers, shamans, witch doctors and medicine men will become the popular medical advisers to a growing body of citizens who will prefer the comfort they will find in consulting the healers of their own choice to submitting to the tyranny of a medical bureaucracy, the perils of thought therapy and (in the case of unpopular citizens) the risk of custody in mental institutions.

In the result, the great profession of scientific medicine, so firmly established in the twentieth century upon the moral traditions and precepts of Hippocrates, will decline and enter a period of eclipse in which it will be overshadowed by the faddist and the faith healer whose appeal will be irresistible to people grown fearful of public authority and suspicious of those associated with it.

Only in the slow process by which physicians in the twenty-first century will repudiate the state's control over the practice of their profession, will public credibility and confidence in their role as healers be restored.

VI. *Welfare of the Future.*

By the end of the twentieth century, the costs of the welfare system will have grown so overwhelmingly that Canada will be faced with the alternative of abandoning it or of entering an era of national impoverishment. There will be no question of distinguishing then between the rich and the poor. Poverty will be the lot of all. The reasons will be apparent to our progeny. *First*, the national guaranteed annual income will, in effect, become the national universal income, and it will be the sum and total received by almost all Canadians. By definition it will continue to be regarded as a poverty income. Most Canadians will receive no less than this fixed sum though they be wholly non-productive and content to do nothing to earn it. By that same token, most Canadians will receive no more than this fixed income even though they toil from dawn to dusk and accept onerous responsibilities. The desire to work, the capacity to work and the productivity of work actually done will be irrelevant to the income received by the individual. His needs,

as determined by the Economic and Social Councils of Canada alone will govern.

Secondly, the increasing proportion of a man's wealth that the state will take, will render it impossible for him to become wealthy either by his earnings or by investment. For most, there will be a hand-to-mouth existence, and for those who are able to save, there will be no worthwhile return on investment. Saving will be regarded as an anti-social act.

Thirdly, egalitarianism will elevate the welfare recipient to the status of model citizen. The right to be supported will become the national ethic, and the duty to work and to produce will be viewed as an aberration from the norm. Under these circumstances, the nation's plant and equipment will grow obsolete; capital will disappear; production will decline and there will be achieved a society in which each citizen will share equally in the poverty of all.

It will be then that the pendulum will swing. The concept of rights and obligations will be examined afresh, and it will be recognized that no citizen can properly claim of his fellow citizens, through the state or otherwise, an annual guaranteed income for life, as a matter of right. It will be found that while it is a simple matter for an individual to contend that he has certain inalienable rights, no right can be enjoyed by him unless some other individual is able and willing to deliver it; that rights and obligations are simply opposite sides of the same coin, and that there is no right to be had, unless there be an equal and corresponding obligation assumed by someone.

When this equation is accepted as a fact of life, the curtain will be lifted between the majestically impersonal tax-collecting machinery of governments on the one side, and the anonymous bureaucratic welfare-dispensing agencies on the other. The citizen receiving his guaranteed stipend from the state will finally become conscious of the fact that although he may not have worked for what he has received, some other citizen has; and that his right to claim sustenance is meaningful only because some other citizen has been willing to assume the burden of giving effect to his claim. He will become aware of the simple fact that his claim to the right to be supported is as empty as a cry in the wilderness except when the conscience of another human being recognizes a duty to respond to his claim; that there really exist no rights but only obligations, and that the first obligation of every man is to care for and maintain himself and those directly dependent upon him, on the simple premise: "If I am not for myself, who will be?". It is then that the concept of welfare will undergo the kind of change that will assign it an appropriate place in the Canadian society: it will reassume its original purpose as an aid for the weak, the dis-

abled and the infirm so long only as they cannot care for themselves.

The concept that the world owes everyone a living, so popular in the latter years of the twentieth century, will gradually fall into disrepute in the twenty-first. Observant and thoughtful people will come to regard mankind as only one of a vast variety of an infinite number of living things that inhabit the earth; that like the trees and the stars, human beings are children of the universe and to that extent, they have a right to be here.⁹ But since no inhabitant of the earth, save man, has ever claimed the right to be supported by all others, the welfare ethic will be rejected. In its place, there will return to prominence, and eventually, to popularity, the work ethic which, in the middle of the twentieth century, had been so denigrated.

Only by accepting and applying the desirability of work will it be possible to rebuild the Canadian economy, so seriously will it have declined in the age of the guaranteed life income. It will be many decades before Canada will find her place again, among the nations whose people, in the middle of the twentieth century, led the world in industrial productivity and inventiveness.

Philosophers, historians and political scientists will wonder why it was that after a period of fifty years of welfarism and rejection of the work ethic, the Canadian pendulum should have swung so decisively away from the lethargic, non-objective way of life pursued by Canadians for half a century. A leading historian will say that the reason lay simply in the oscillations of the value-system. An outstanding economist will point to the paradox of the sheer poverty in the midst of vast potential wealth that finally moved Canadians to change their stance on the welfare issue and resume the serious development of their land. A distinguished philosopher will say that man, as a rational creature, could not long maintain the irrationalities of a welfare state and revolted against its strictures. A lawyer will venture the view that the change from welfare to work was simply a matter of finding a way out of boredom when the fun and games of the entertainment and travel industries were no longer amusing, and people decided to use their lives seriously and to play for keeps.

When the measure of man is taken by the duties he assumes rather than by the rights he demands, assistance to the needy will become personalized. One of the justifiable criticisms of the welfare system throughout the latter half of the twentieth century was based upon its impersonality and hence its inhumanity. It treated all claimants according to fixed formulae

⁹ From *Desiderata*, by Max Ehrmann (1872-1945) whose statement acquired great popularity in the latter part of the century.

that failed to take account of individual differences and idiosyncrasies. The computer determined eligibility, and the machine proceeded with its calculations as to quantum. So gargantuan had the system grown, even those who had benefited from it most came to believe that it was time to revise its procedures and ultimately, to rethink its philosophy.

To humanize the process of assisting those in need, the welfare system will cease to be a function of government. The problems of determining who genuinely are entitled to aid will become a function of those groups and associations who have most consistently concerned themselves with humane and charitable works. The churches, synagogues and temples of the world have occupied this role for centuries, recognizing that:

. . . the poor shall never cease out of the land; therefore I command thee, saying, thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother. . . .¹⁰

During the twentieth century, most of these religious organizations were more concerned with charitable works in distant lands than with the needs of their parishioners and neighbours close at hand. The reasons for this curious phenomenon were twofold: *first*, since governments appeared to be assuming the burden of welfare at home, the charitable role of religious organizations became superfluous. And *secondly*, it was then, as always, simpler to love and help neighbours who lived ten thousand miles away in foreign lands, than those who shared a common language and a common bathroom.

In the twenty-first century, men will begin to recognize that if the world's affairs are to be set right, it is necessary to first set matters right at home. When religious organizations at last renounce their political ambitions and put away their international pretensions, they will regain the confidence of their parishioners, who will once more make the temple and the church their house. That house in turn will be able to bestow material and spiritual comfort upon those in need. When this miraculous change appears, the same religious organizations will also win the confidence of governments, who will be grateful at last to discover a simpler, less expensive and more satisfactory way of providing funds for those who genuinely require assistance. It will be found that the parish priest knows more about the needs of the people who come to him for help, acts more wisely, wastes less and achieves a happier result than all of the clerks of all of the government welfare offices that did business in the twentieth century. He will view a man in need as a whole person and not as a mere social security number. And to the new relationship that will thus come into being, there

¹⁰ Deuteronomy, 15:11.

will be brought a fresh dimension of love and understanding and faith that no Parliament had ever succeeded in legislating, and no government had ever found a way of administering.
