



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
OF  
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMISTS

HELD AT  
MACDONALD COLLEGE  
CANADA  
21 AUGUST TO 28 AUGUST 1938

LONDON  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
HUMPHREY MILFORD  
1939

## EDITOR'S NOTE

THE arrangement and presentation of this volume<sup>1</sup> requires no explanation except in one or two minor details.

An outline of the construction of the programme of the Fifth Conference, which determined the character and scope of the contents of the *Proceedings*, will be found in the Opening Address by the President on p. 20 *et seq.*

The order of subjects as they are published differs from the chronological order of the programme of the Conference. For convenience the four main subjects which were given the major part of the time of the Conference have been brought together into one section (pp. 27-315), although they occupied the first, second, fourth, and sixth days of the programme. The other papers read at the full Conference sessions for which no time was allowed for discussion are brought together in another section (pp. 316-400), although they were delivered at different times on the third, fifth, and sixth days of the programme. The departure from the chronological order of the programme creates no difficulties for the reader, and, since the extended discussions on the four main subjects constitute a different type of material and presentation from the non-discussion papers, there is a convenience in the arrangement adopted.

Another minor matter arises in the case of the opening papers of the main subjects. These were printed before the Conference and circulated in advance proof form. It happens that speakers in discussion had occasion to quote passages from the papers as they appeared in the advance proofs. Some of these passages were, however, altered by the authors when the papers were read or were revised subsequently. Where this occurs, care has been taken to note that the speaker is quoting from the Proof Copy. It is safe to say that except in one instance—and there both forms of the statement are quoted by the speaker himself—there is no detriment to the point made by the speaker.

<sup>1</sup> This is the fifth volume of the *Proceedings of the International Conference of Agricultural Economists*. Volumes i and ii of the *Proceedings*, reporting the First and Second Conferences, held in 1929 and 1930, were published by the George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisc., U.S.A., 1930. Volumes iii and iv, reporting the Third and Fourth Conferences, held in 1934 and 1936, were published by the Oxford University Press, 1935 and 1937.

Copies of all four volumes are obtainable from J. R. Currie, Research Dept. (Economics), Dartington Hall, Totnes, Devon, England; and in Canada and the United States of America from C. E. Ladd, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. Copies of volumes iii and iv are obtainable also from the publishers.

One important part of the programme is not published in full in the *Proceedings*. Two sessions of the Conference were allocated to sectional group meetings for the discussion of special topics of interest to experts in various branches of research or teaching in agricultural economics. Since several of these group meetings were held concurrently, it was impossible to undertake a verbatim record of the discussions. Short statements of the scope of the subjects have been prepared and will be found, together with the names of those taking part, on pp. 401-5.

A photograph, with key, of the members and visitors attending the Conference is placed between pp. 406 and 407, and the register of attendance on pp. 408-13.

The editor wishes to thank all speakers who, despite the distant parts to which they were scattered after the conclusion of the Conference, so promptly revised and returned the transcripts of their speeches.

*Particulars of the International Conference of Agricultural Economists, its constitution, and a list of members and correspondents in the various countries will be found on pp. 414-33.*

## ADDRESSES OF WELCOME AND REPLY

DR. J. E. LATTIMER, *Macdonald College, Quebec, Canada*

IT is a great pleasure to me to act as temporary chairman at this opening meeting of the Fifth International Conference of Agricultural Economists. I do so as chairman of the Canadian Committee which has been responsible for the local arrangements of this Conference, and it is with feelings of great gratification that, on behalf of the Committee, I am privileged to be the first to welcome such a large and representative group of distinguished people. It is also a great personal pleasure to me to welcome to Canada and to Macdonald College the many old friends from other countries whom it has been my good fortune to meet at our earlier Conferences and in other ways.

My primary duty here, however, is to introduce the distinguished visitors and members who are with me here on the platform and who will extend to you a welcome on behalf of the bodies which they represent: Dr. J. J. O'Neill, Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, McGill University, on behalf of McGill University of which Macdonald College is a part; Professor R. Summerby, Acting Dean of this College, on behalf of Macdonald College; Dr. H. Barton, Deputy Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion, on behalf of the Canadian Government; M. Henri C. Bois, Co-opérative Fédérée de Québec, on behalf of the Provincial Government of Quebec and the Agricultural Economists of Quebec; Dr. J. F. Booth, Chief of the Economics Division, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, on behalf of the Agricultural Economics Society of Canada; Professor H. C. M. Case, University of Illinois, U.S.A., chairman of the U.S. council of the International Conference, on behalf of the U.S. members.

DR. J. J. O'NEILL, *Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.*

Principal Douglas and Dean Brittain have asked me to express to you their regrets that they are unable to be here this evening. I have then the very great privilege of welcoming you on behalf of McGill University to Macdonald College. We are very much alive to the compliment which you have paid Macdonald in choosing this place for your Fifth International Conference. We flatter ourselves that

this is, to some extent at least, a recognition and perhaps an endorsement of the work which is being carried on here.

We in Montreal have watched with much sympathy and a great deal of admiration the development of an outstanding research institute in Macdonald, which has made it much more than an Agricultural College. In my capacity as Dean of Science and also as Dean of Graduate Studies and Research at McGill, I have had an opportunity to watch this development. The problems which have been presented are varied and of wide scope. They are not problems which can be solved ordinarily by any one department; they involve the co-operation of various sciences. That is to say, investigators must either be trained in phases of more than one science, or there must be a close co-operation between various departments of science in the investigation. We realize also the fact that there is a great field of research in what are commonly called the border-line sciences, that is, some place in between the work which is ordinarily carried on by the recognized scientific departments. That field requires, of course, a very close co-operation between departments. I am very happy to say that that co-operation is operative and entirely available in all the departments at McGill, between those at Macdonald College and those located in Montreal, and, further, it is a privilege to acknowledge the very hearty co-operation and assistance of the various Departments of Government—those situated at Quebec, the Federal Departments at Ottawa, and indeed the Departments of Agriculture in all the Provinces of this country.

This Conference is doing very important work. Its work, however, is based upon the use of precise data and ascertained facts; the fewer the variables that enter into your calculations the better your results. Our job is to ascertain as many facts as possible for your consideration, and to eliminate the variables.

McGill gives you a very cordial welcome. We are highly honoured that you have come here. We trust that your sessions will be of great interest and profit to you, that your surroundings here are to your liking, that you are very comfortable, and that you will carry away a memory which will lead you to want to come back again to Macdonald in the not too distant future.

PROFESSOR R. SUMMERBY, *Acting Dean, Macdonald College, St. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q., Canada.*

The first thing that I should do to-night is to apologize for the sort of weather that we are having for you. Perhaps some of you are not aware that the Meteorological Service of Canada is located

in Toronto. As a rule we get very hearty co-operation from that service, but to-night that co-operation is not extended to the point of providing us with the nicest of weather. We hope it will improve.

I am very sorry that Dr. Brittain, Vice-Principal of Macdonald College and Dean of Agriculture, is not here to-night. He would have been very happy to be here to greet you and to welcome you. Unfortunately for us he has to attend a conference in Australia next month, and is at the present time on his way to it.

Before extending you a word of welcome, I think it would be in order for me to give you in a very few words the background of our situation at Macdonald College, something of its origin and its functions. Some of you already know the history and work of Macdonald College, but on the other hand I believe that there are many from outside who do not. Macdonald College was founded by Sir William Macdonald, a wealthy philanthropist of Montreal, who was very much interested in education. His contributions to education in Canada cover a very wide field. To McGill University he contributed funds for several important buildings; he endowed several chairs, established many scholarships, and contributed generously to the upkeep of the University. In addition, Sir William made distinct contributions to the cause of education in Canada by establishing the first consolidated schools, through the introduction of nature study, manual training, and household science in a number of important centres. In later years Sir William Macdonald became particularly interested in rural problems. He had the concept that there were three important institutions of rural life, namely, the farm, the home, and the school. It was for this reason that he established three schools here—a school for teachers, a school of household science, and a school of agriculture. In providing for them at Macdonald College he stated that the purpose was ‘to disseminate information and to advance knowledge with particular reference to rural interests’.

Those of you who know our Canadian system realize that the control of education is in the hands of the Provinces. As far as the School for Teachers is concerned, the function of Macdonald College is to train young men and young women for the teaching profession in the province of Quebec. In the School of Household Science we have two types of course. One of these is designed to give information and training to young women for dealing with problems of the home in an intelligent manner. Secondly, there is a degree course lasting for four years, in which training in the scientific subjects which are basic to home economics or household

science is given. This qualifies students for positions in institutions of one kind or another, and for teaching.

In the School of Agriculture we have three types of work. Firstly, there is the Diploma Course, which is intended to provide farm boys who intend to go back to the farm with information and training that will help them to deal most effectively with their problems. This course lasts for two years. Secondly, there is the Degree Course, in which a much more scientific training is given. In the first two years the sciences basic to agriculture are stressed. In the third and fourth years additional work is given along these lines, and, in addition, training is given along a number of special lines. There are some twelve options available, which men pursuing agricultural work towards a degree can take. Thirdly, there is a considerable number of graduate courses given by our staff in agriculture. This graduate work, however, is under the jurisdiction of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at McGill. Such work leads to the degree of Master of Science or, in the case of a few subjects, to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

That gives you an outline of our teaching work. Of course, along with this, and related particularly to the more advanced work leading to higher degrees, an extensive programme of research work that is intended to be of most value to the agricultural population of Canada, and particularly to the province of Quebec, is in progress.

Macdonald College is a part of McGill University. It is financed by an endowment provided by Sir William Macdonald, although I should mention that grants are obtained from the Government for special lines of research work. Macdonald College is national in character. A number of our Household Science students come from all parts of the Dominion, some from the United States, and some from other parts of the Empire. As far as our graduate students are concerned, most of them come from outside of the province of Quebec.

As I have already outlined to you, the founder considered the farm, the home, and the school as the basic institutions of rural life. He aimed to help to produce a happy, prosperous, well-informed, intelligent type of citizen with high ideals of life and a high standard of living. This problem is to a considerable extent an economic one. In a broad sense it is basically economic. With this background, you can understand that we are much interested in your Conference.

We are proud to have you honour us with your presence; we are happy indeed to place our facilities at your disposal; and we welcome you most heartily and very sincerely.



DR. H. BARTON, *Deputy Minister, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.*

As Professor Summerby has indicated, it would almost seem as if the warmth of your Canadian reception had already been overdone. However, it is my happy duty to extend to so many representatives of so many different countries a very cordial welcome to Canada. We are very pleased that this Conference is being held in this country, and we are honoured in being among the five countries of the world in which such a conference has been held.

I suppose for many of you this is your first visit to Canada, and we are in the habit of advising those who are making initial visits that, because of the extent of this country, the range in its climatic conditions, and the diversity of its agriculture, one cannot hope to gain a very comprehensive first-hand knowledge in a single visit unless it be an extended one. I do not suppose any such advice is necessary to agricultural economists.

I need hardly tell you, I am sure, that Canada is not without her so-called agricultural economic problems. There are those who think that all Canadian problems really centre in agriculture. And while we hardly expect that a solution of perhaps any of them will be found in this Conference, even extending as it does for a full week and an extra Sunday, we are nevertheless very glad to welcome the opportunity of learning from the experience of others.

I am taking the liberty of giving you a glimpse of agriculture as a whole in Canada in case some of you may not have an opportunity of getting a perspective of it. To many of you Canada is best known in terms of wheat or perhaps more recently in terms of droughts. In order to see what we hope are the remedies for drought and for the return of wheat you would still have to travel a long way west. I have just returned from western Canada where wheat-growing is a highly specialized type of farm enterprise in large areas. The people in those areas are quite convinced, and I am quite convinced, whatever that may be worth, that wheat-growing will continue to be a highly specialized enterprise in those areas, because there is no alternative quite so suitable and because of the conviction that, if wheat cannot be produced successfully and marketed profitably under the conditions which obtain there, despite periodic drought, it cannot be done anywhere else.

Wheat-growing, however, is not the only speciality in western Canada. Live-stock farming is still a major specialized enterprise there. Other specialities are not unknown, but diversified agricul-

ture is rapidly reinforcing a great deal of specialized agriculture, and there are big areas of western Canada where mixed farming has always prevailed. Let me give you some idea of the contrasts that one may find on the so-called prairies of this country. I was examining last week projects which involve the development of agricultural practice in two adjacent areas. The one comprises some 300,000 acres, which will be devoted exclusively to a form of controlled pasture. The other right beside it—the two, we hope, will be complementary and supplementary—is an area of some 4,000 acres on which the intention is to establish some 150 farms. I do not know that any more striking contrast in agriculture could be found anywhere.

Here at Macdonald College you are not in the centre of Canada geographically speaking, but you are in what we regard as the heart and the centre of mixed farming in Canada. You will find dairying is the basic feature with many combinations, but also beef cattle and grain-growing for sale as basic features in other combinations. You will find extensive vegetable gardening; you will find fruit-growing on quite a substantial scale; and with it all, general agriculture. In our Maritime provinces in the east and also in British Columbia, we again have highly specialized types of agriculture, but also with a background of general farming. We can grow a great many things in this country. We are a young, ambitious people, resourceful, we think, and so we have been tempted to commercialize production of a great many of them—perhaps too many. That has brought with it problems of adaptability and instability which only the process of time and experience can solve. From a marketing standpoint, we are favourably situated with respect to at least two of the large areas of population in the world, and that has meant a natural inclination to divide our surplus, since we are an exporting country, between the two. While that has had its advantages, it has also had its handicaps. It has complicated the problem for the agricultural economist, and it has confused the minds of those who are called upon from time to time to pronounce on policy.

I have been interested in your programme. I have observed with some satisfaction that you apparently have deliberately limited it and, I judge, have focused it on the comparatively few considerations which are, in the experience of economists, of vital importance to agriculture. It struck me that it might not be without some significance that, while these problems or these considerations as indicated in the programme are certainly not new, they still appear presumably to be of almost equal importance in both the old and the new

countries. A great deal is expected from the agricultural economists, and I speak as a friend, as one who has faith in the contribution the agricultural economist can make. If agricultural economics is to be a science, I take it it must be an applied science. That means its function must be the solution of problems, and that must be its objective. You will not mind my saying, I am sure, that only in so far as conferences of this kind and the accumulation of data contribute to that kind of objective will that type of activity be justified. I hope that I may express on behalf of Canada the wish that you will enjoy your visit to this country, and that you will not be disappointed in what you see.

HENRI C. BOIS, *Co-opérative Fédérée de Québec, Montreal, Canada.*

It is an honour and a pleasure for me to extend to you, on behalf of the Government and of the Society of Technical Agriculturists of the Province of Quebec, a most hearty welcome and to assure you of our best wishes. You may feel sure that our rural people and the technical agriculturists will follow with great interest the discussions of this Conference. We will derive from them information which will help us in solving our own difficulties.

Quebec, an agricultural province whose ambition is to remain as such, will doubtless benefit from the experience of men who live in countries where the evolution is more advanced and where the problems, the study of which is at its very beginning here, have existed for years or even for centuries. Because of the feeling of brotherhood and fellowship which must unite all men, we are glad of your presence and—if we bear in mind the value of the papers delivered at the past Conferences of your association—we are sure that your stay with us will be beneficial to our community. Therefore, you are twice welcome.

The programme of this Conference shows a firm decision to study economics in relation to the welfare of men. The difficulties of these past years have made it a duty of all those who bear responsibilities towards their fellow-citizens, to look more fully into the final result of economics in the establishment of social welfare. Our agriculture has not been without suffering from the economic disturbances; nor has it escaped, and cannot escape, social maladjustments.

In Quebec, the general aspect of our agriculture and of our rural social organization being a rather unique one, it seems that it would not be out of place to give you a few words about it. The fundamental unit here is the parish. In the country the parish often constitutes a self-sustaining unit. The municipal administration, the

school system, and the religious organization are ordinarily to be found within a fairly limited area. At the small village we usually find the doctor, the notary, the lawyer, sometimes an agronomer, the butter and cheese factory, the general store, the branch of a bank, &c. Organized on this plan, the local life is one of particular strength and gives rise to certain initiatives which would not otherwise exist.

While the farm of the typical Quebec farmer is not a fully commercialized farm, neither is it a farm organized on the peasant pattern. The good sense of our people, together with historical and economic reasons, is responsible for their having adopted the middle way. Production is diversified. On the typical farm we find milk, bacon, hens, cereals for sale, potatoes, and a certain quantity of other products varying with the local conditions. However, no one of these products is sufficiently developed to permit one to classify the farm as a dairy farm, a truck farm, or a fruit farm. At the same time, large families furnish the necessary labour, and the farmer makes a point of organizing his system so that he seldom needs outside labour. Handicrafts are to be found on several farms, and, should the circumstances require it, the farm could be a self-sustaining unit.

Without turning to a strictly peasant-type agriculture, our people have taken care to avoid the necessity of exchanging each year considerable quantities of products in order to make a living and keep possession of their property. Under these conditions, the depression and the low prices paid for agricultural products in the past seven or eight years have not affected our farmers to the same degree as the farmers of certain other provinces where farms are organized on a purely exchange basis.

In view of the difficulties which they encountered and in order to feel safe in every way, our rural people turned back to a more or less self-sustaining type of farming. These last years have seen an increased interest in rural arts, handicrafts, and types of production which were readopted with the sole purpose of reducing the necessary cash outlays. Our farmers have minimized to the extreme limit their obligation to make outside purchases. So much so that in the worst years they could carry on with lesser sufferings. For a year or so, better days have seemed to be coming, and, as soon as prices rise, our farmers will tend to increase their sales and their outside purchases. Undoubtedly, the low-price period has affected our agriculture, but we can see that the disturbance has been comparatively less in the sections where the farms were organized on a

lesser commercial basis. You will pardon me for having emphasized this aspect of our farming industry. I have done it because it is a typical characteristic and because this point may help you to understand better the Quebecers with whom you may come into contact during your stay.

Again I extend to you a most hearty welcome on behalf of the Government and of the Professional Association of Technical Agriculturists and our best wishes for the success of your Conference.

DR. J. F. BOOTH, *Economics Division, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.*

It is a very great pleasure for me on behalf of the Agricultural Economists of Canada to extend a welcome to the members of the International Conference. This marks the tenth year of the existence of the Canadian Agricultural Economics Society, and, although we are still a very small body, it gives us a great deal of pleasure to welcome you here to-night. This also represents the culmination of a dream that had its origin three years ago. About that time the suggestion was first made that the agricultural economists of this country might have the temerity to invite this large body to meet here in 1938. When you decided at St. Andrews in 1936 to come to Canada, you conferred an honour on this country and upon our organization that we all very much appreciate.

We are mindful of the fact that in addition to the members of the Conference who are here, there are many visitors and guests from other countries, and from Canada, and we extend the most hearty welcome to them also.

Having discharged these more or less official duties, may I become a bit more personal? I had the good fortune this last spring to visit a number of the countries of Europe. I met many of the agricultural economists of the United Kingdom and of western Europe. To you who are here to-night and to your associates at home I take this opportunity of expressing a personal word of appreciation for the many kindnesses shown me on the occasion of that trip.

To many of you the English language is not a native language, and you may have difficulty in making yourself understood, and in understanding us, just as I had on my tour through Europe; and if I refer to an experience or two, perhaps you will see some connexion; maybe you, too, will have similar experiences on this continent. I was leaving Cracow, Poland, for Berlin, after having visited Dr. Schmidt, who is with us here to-night, and had been told that if

I went about it in the proper way I might have the whole of a second-class sleeping-car compartment to myself. So I proceeded, with my half-dozen words of German—for I suspected the sleeping-car attendant spoke German—and with many gestures, to make known my desires. After I had been thus endeavouring to make myself understood for some minutes, he turned to me and, in the most perfect English, said, 'Do you by any chance speak English?'

Even those of you who come from the United Kingdom and from other English-speaking countries, perhaps even those from the United States, may find it difficult to understand us, and I think we may have difficulty in understanding you. I am reminded of another experience to illustrate that point. Upon registering in a London hotel I called the information desk to ask if there was a barber in the hotel. The young lady who answered the telephone said, 'I don't know, but I will make inquiries,' which seemed a bit odd to me; but, not knowing the ways of English hotels, I accepted the explanation and hung up the telephone receiver. About five minutes later the porter appeared at the door and said, 'You asked for a Bible, sir?' You may have experiences of this nature while you are here that you may tell to your students, to your Service Clubs, or to other bodies back home, but we all hope that they will not be too embarrassing.

May I add, having referred to our friends from the United Kingdom and Europe, that we are particularly pleased to welcome such a large delegation from the United States? Most of the agricultural economists of your country are known personally to your fellow-workers in Canada, and those of you that are not known personally are known by reputation. Many of our members have received instruction as graduate students in the institutions that you represent. I think they would wish me to-night to express a word of appreciation to you from across the border for the many kindnesses you have shown us in years past.

And now, to all of you from wherever you come, the Agricultural Economists of Canada extend a hand of welcome.

PROFESSOR H. C. M. CASE, *University of Illinois, U.S.A.*

Passing over the unguarded boundary-line between the United States and Canada, you will find no marked change taking place except man-made devices such as customs inspection. Those of us who have had the opportunity to meet the men who represent the agricultural economic interests in Canada in our annual meetings of the American Farm Economic Association and in other gatherings,

feel that we are in a sense a part of a single group. Just as we put aside any thought of national barriers between countries in the International Conference where we are seeking to discuss economic problems for our common benefit, we like to think of our Canadian friends as part of one group with us. I am happy on behalf of our members from the United States to join in welcoming you to this shore of the ocean.

Certainly this is a most happy occasion for us, meeting here on Canadian soil, with representatives to bring us impressions and experiences from so many countries, with the prospect of a free give and take of opinion, points of view, and new contributions to agricultural economic thinking.

I like to stop and consider how fortunate I am to be associated with agricultural economic work. As I see it, agriculture is a world business, and when those who are devoting their best efforts to the economic problems of agriculture get together there is a common tie—a mutual interest—which it would be difficult to find among workers in other lines of activity. To me there is something a little more human in working with agriculture and agricultural people than in working along many scientific lines, or even in other economic phases of national life.

As we view agriculture the world over, we all appreciate that in our own countries a larger proportion of our people are directly dependent upon the agriculture of the country than upon any other single line of industry. What can be more important than to meet for the purpose of discussing policies and matters fundamental to the welfare of those whose living comes from the soil? I am convinced that the level of living which is achieved for agriculture determines in a very definite way the level of living of the nation. More and more it seems to me that, with the spirit of nationalism dominating our economic lives as it does, we must attempt to attain a more balanced economic and social life in our respective countries, and more and more, therefore, is there a necessity of keeping our agricultural house in order, so that it may contribute its whole measure of support to the well-being of our respective nations.

As I look over this group and recognize faces from the United States, I think we have a very representative cross-section of our American agricultural economists with us. From previous association with the International Conference, I am sure that in these pleasant surroundings we have in store for us a wonderful week's experience. It is a real privilege to meet with those who are working on similar problems but under somewhat different conditions in

other countries, and, regardless of what language we speak, to come to know the personalities thinking constructively on agricultural matters in other countries, whose problems are just as real, whose sense of responsibility to their country and agriculture is just as sincere as our own. I am sure we shall use every opportunity which is ours this week of becoming acquainted with our neighbours from other countries who are here with us.

We from the United States and Canada have been brought up in relatively new countries. The way of opportunity has been open to the man who was capable of wrestling with the forces of nature. But as our country has developed we find ourselves perhaps just beginning to face problems which are old to many of you who come to this Conference from overseas. The events which have occurred since the First International Conference of Agricultural Economists bring to me more fully a realization of how valuable an opportunity some of us in the newer countries have, in this Conference, to learn from you who have already long wrestled with the problems with which we are confronted. I fully expect that speakers in this Conference will give a new touch to some points of view, and that some of the inspiration which will come to those who are privileged to attend this Conference will have a very lasting influence on their life's work. As one looks back over the development of agricultural economic work in any country, one can see the shift in emphasis from time to time. In our own country, the emphasis on farm management shifted for a time over to marketing, later to price analysis, then to the discussion of agricultural policies, and we hope with these changes in emphasis that agricultural economics is coming to include a well-rounded consideration of the economic and social problems of our farm people. Coming out of a conference of this kind, I believe we will find increasing emphasis upon the social aspects of agriculture and the well-being of those who receive their sustenance from the land. The problems, however, are too great for any individual to solve, and there is strength to blaze some new trails of thinking in a conference such as this represents.

In closing, I wish to pay special tribute to those who conceived the idea of the International Conference and brought it to reality. Mr. Elmhirst, agricultural economic workers owe a debt to you for the inspiration and material assistance which you have put forth in bringing this Conference into being. It is with deep regret, as we look over the group, that we find there are certain men not present who had such a real part in helping to shape the course of the Conference as did our own Dr. Warren, whom we will not be



privileged to have with us again. In closing, I wish to say, Mr. Elmhirst, that probably our Conference never will represent quite the freedom of give and take, quite the intimacy which was experienced in the initial Conference at Dartington Hall. On the other hand, there is strength in numbers, and it is my belief that this conference is destined to be greater than preceding ones, and that as each conference is called we will have gained much in broadening the interest in our organization and a wider participation representing both more people and more countries.

DR. J. E. LATTIMER.

The previous speakers have left no doubt of the cordiality of the welcome. Perhaps a noticeable omission which I might rectify is that the ladies who are present have not been given a special welcome. We have on this occasion a larger representation of ladies than I think we have had at any previous Conference. You are all acquainted with the report that when some economists first thought of taking up this line of effort, they were met with the remark: 'Do you expect some day to have a wife and family, and what chance is there for assuming such responsibilities if you follow so unremunerative a calling as you propose?' When the study of agricultural economics was taken up the remark was repeated. Now we find not only many agricultural economists who can attend a conference of this nature, but many of them able to bring their wives and families. The latter are welcome, not only for themselves, but also as a refutation of the libel under which we as agricultural economists sometimes suffered.

And now it is nearly time to turn this Conference over to your permanent chairman, the President. Perhaps, I should preface this with a story. A motorist was starting from the seaboard towards Chicago and, as he passed the hilly country, inquired of a native about the road. The local resident said, 'If you proceed a few miles and turn to the right, you will find the best road.' Then he thought it over and said, 'No, if you go back a few miles and turn to the left, you will find the best road.' After thinking a while longer he said, 'No, I guess if I were going to Chicago, I would not start from here at all.' I hope the stage to which my temporary chairmanship has brought the Conference is not as bad as that.

Now we have a little formal ceremony—that of handing over to your President, Mr. Elmhirst, who needs no introduction, the Cowbell which has crossed the pond more often than many of us here and which has been the symbol of authority of the President at all

our Conferences. I hand it over to Mr. Elmhirst and with it the chairmanship of this meeting and of the other sessions of our Conference at Macdonald College.

L. K. ELMHIRST, *President, Dartington Hall, England.*

My first task in taking over the custody of the Cow-bell from Professor Lattimer is to strike a note of sadness. Since our last Conference, two of our most distinguished members have died, Hans Zörner and Dr. Warren. I feel sure that at this opening of our Conference you will wish to pay a tribute to the memory of those great friends who from the first Conference in 1929 did so much to promote the success of our society. To-night I would like to recall not only the services they rendered, but more particularly the sincerity of their friendship and those companionable qualities which made the times we spent in their presence a happy treasured memory.

Hans Zörner was known to most of you. His scientific contributions are published in our Proceedings and will be studied again and again for the thoroughness and directness with which he dealt with his subject; but shall we ever forget how he laughed and how he sang? When I travelled with him in Russia for six weeks he was always bursting into song, even in the middle of the Caucasus. His English favourites were 'Tipperary' and 'Loch Lomond', and many of you will remember that at our Conference concerts he became a co-opted Scot by leading the verses of 'Loch Lomond'. It was characteristic of him that, when he came to our first Conference in Devon, his knowledge of English was only three weeks old and, as he himself used to say, was given a tortuous start by being under the joint influence of a Scot and an American. Yet, by the end of that Conference, he made a speech in English. I do not think we shall so easily carry through any Conference again without him, without his fund of humour, his love of play, and his enthusiasm for the purposes of our meetings.

Of Dr. Warren, how can I hope to express all that his personality meant to our Conference and to me as President? When Dr. Ladd first broached to me in England his idea that an international conference of agricultural economists should be held at Dartington, we agreed to let the decision rest on the approval of Dr. Warren. I well remember the moment when Dr. Warren's reply came, and the die was cast for that first Conference and the movement was set on foot which has grown to this large and representative gathering that we have here to-night from many corners of the earth. Of Dr. Warren, too, I would recall his talent for friendship, his fund of humour,

and his willingness—his eagerness—to join in every form of the social activity that has been the life of our Conferences. Can you picture him swathed in pads and gloves, armed with an unfamiliar weapon, taking the field for his side at a cricket match on the Dartington field? Perhaps I might recall a little experience also at that first Conference at Dartington. It was Saturday night and without any difficulty we persuaded Dr. Warren and Mr. Secretary Wallace to attend a local fair at Dartmouth. One of the shows of the fair was a long tunnel slowly revolving, and the game was to enter at the one end and walk steadily through to the other end without being knocked off one's balance. Warren paid his sixpence and walked in, but the tunnel won, and he was toppled on the floor and rolled about until he was hauled out by the attendant. As soon as he was on his feet again, he ran round, paid his entry money a second time, and had another go. This time he got out on his own, but only by crawling on his hands and knees. That was not good enough for him. Round he went again, and for his third sixpence he walked triumphantly through.

I tell you this story because I think it is typical of the Warren we knew and loved and revered—a man who entered into all the fun of the fair and, in this as in all things, a man who never gave up trying until he had achieved his end. I need not recall his work, his contributions to our proceedings, and his great service to our Conference. These are known to you all. No one has assisted more than Dr. Warren in laying the solid foundations of our society.

I am sure it is your wish that I should send messages from this Conference to Frau Zörner and Mrs. Warren, and to their families.

*The audience stood in silence in memory of Dr. Zörner and Dr. Warren.*

And now to those friends who for one reason or another have regretfully been unable to be present at this Conference. Last Easter I had the pleasure of spending an evening in his home with our Vice-President, Dr. Sering, and I have a warm letter of greeting to you all from him. His wife and his doctor would not allow him, much as he wished, to cross the ocean to be with us. I am sure you will wish me to convey to him and to Frau Sering your remembrances and good wishes.

I have here a long list of people who have also sent their regrets and good wishes to you. Many of them hoped up to the last minute to be able to make the trip.

From northern Europe we have greetings from Professor Larsen, Denmark; Professor Borgedal, Norway; Professor Björkman,

Sweden; Dr. Jutila and Mr. Lehtinen, Finland; and Professor Starcs, Latvia. Along with Mr. Maxton, I had the pleasure of meeting all of these members and their colleagues during the tour which I made as your President last autumn. Denmark and Finland are represented at this gathering. A representative from Latvia unfortunately met with an accident when he arrived in this country.

From eastern and south-eastern Europe greetings have come from Dr. Brdlik, Czechoslovakia; Professor Ihrig, Dr. Varga, and Professor Kenéz, Hungary; Professor Molloff and Dr. Anderson, Bulgaria (all three countries have extended warm invitations to us to be their guests for the next Conference); Professor Conateanu, Roumania; Professor Evelpedi and Dr. Mussouros, Greece; and Dr. Franges, Yugoslavia. All of these members assisted in arranging meetings of groups of agricultural economists when I visited their respective countries last autumn. Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria are represented at our meeting here.

From central and southern Europe letters of good wishes have come from Professor von Dietze, Germany (who has unfortunately been unable to come to read his paper); Professor Tassinari, Professor Lorenzoni, and Professor Serpieri, Italy; and from Professor Laur and Dr. Howald, Switzerland. All of these I was again fortunate to meet on my tour last autumn or at Easter this year. Germany is strongly represented at our meeting, but unfortunately no one has been able to attend from our groups in Italy or Switzerland.

From the international centres, Dr. Pavlovski, International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, and Dr. von Bülow, International Labour Office, Geneva, send their regrets and good wishes. Both organizations have nominated a member of our Conference to represent them here.

From western Europe greetings have been received from Dr. Louwes and Dr. Smit, Holland; M. Forget and Professor Baptiste, Belgium; Mr. Bridges, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Harkness, United Kingdom. With the exception of Belgium, these countries are strongly represented. Another member who had hoped very much to be present and who had agreed to read a paper, Professor Elazari-Volcani, Palestine, has written to say how deeply he regrets that the situation in his country has prevented his coming and to wish us a very successful conference.

When I look round this gathering, I find it difficult to believe that there are any members in the United States of America who are not present, but I am sure we all share the regret that Governor Myers, Dr. Warren's successor at Cornell, and Professor Andrew

Boss are among those absent, a regret which they themselves have expressed in their letters of good wishes.

Out of all the many letters I have one that I think you will be interested to hear read. In the early days of Cornell University when the Agricultural College was being built up, the Dean had a feeling that there ought to be teaching on farm economics. Admitting that he himself was a botanist and knew nothing of economics, he decided to gamble on a young man whose name was little known at the time. The young man was George F. Warren; the Dean of the College was Dr. Liberty Hyde Bailey. Dr. Warren's death has broken that long association, and I wrote to Dr. Bailey, who is now over eighty years of age, asking him if he would like to send a message to this Conference. This is what he writes:

Dear Mr. Elmhirst,

Your pleasant note of July 30th opens the gates of memory. My early instruction on agricultural subjects in college stressed the chemical basis of it, following the work of Liebig and Boussingault; then the biological base was foremost, after the work of Pasteur and Darwin, followed by the search for new plants and crops; defence against insects and diseases became a major emphasis of teaching and research; study of the physical nature of the soil opened new fields; the place of animals and their products assumed large proportions; betterments in labour-saving and efficient machines and mechanisms came to the fore as subjects of teaching. Then arose the study of labour costs and markets and the notable development of economic studies, to which we are now so hopefully committed.

New social relationships, with direct implications in government, are beginning to emerge. We shall some day uncover the vast subject of the fitness of the individual beyond his technical knowledge, with new intentions in education.

It is stimulating to review all these developments and to catch even obscure vistas. Therefore, I wish you well in your Conference in Quebec and I shall watch the result with confidence.

Cordially yours,

L. H. BAILEY.

And now it is my pleasant duty on your behalf to offer thanks to the speakers this evening who have given us such a warm welcome. We have already had an opportunity to judge of the accommodation and hospitality which Macdonald College is extending to us, and we know that we are going to be exceedingly comfortable. We have been told that all the facilities offered to us are available to the ordinary students in term time, and all I can say is that the students are very fortunate. I hope that Dr. O'Neill and Professor

Summerby will convey to the authorities of McGill University and Macdonald College our gratitude for extending to us these facilities and for their interest in our Conference. I would also ask Dr. Barton to carry back to his Government and to Mr. Gardiner, the Minister of Agriculture for Canada, our respects and thanks for all that the Department of Agriculture in Canada has done to make our meeting a success and to give us every possible facility. I would like, too, to thank Dr. Barton personally for the challenge which he has made this evening to agricultural economics. I think we can say that we gladly take it up.

Those of us who have been on the tour through the Province of Quebec and have had direct experience of the wide variety of services and contacts offered by the Government of Quebec will wish M. Bois to convey to his Government and especially to M. Dus-sault, the Minister of Agriculture for the Province, our warmest thanks for one of the most interesting tours that I think it has been our pleasure to undertake. Will he also convey to those schools, institutions, agronomes, experimental farms, colleges, and so many others who assisted in the tour, our gratitude? I hope that he will not forget to include those living creatures of the Laurentide Park; the trout who responded so hospitably to the bait the visiting economists offered them; the kindly bear with her two cubs who looked in to welcome us at Lac Jacques Cartier; the wild moose who so thoughtfully stood by the roadside that we might see him free in his natural surroundings.

To Dr. Booth for the greeting he has brought from the Agricultural Economics Society of Canada and to Professor Case who, as chairman of the imposing army of members in the United States of America, has so warmly welcomed the Conference to this continent of North America, I express our sincere appreciation and thanks. Nor would you want me to forget Professor Lattimer for his genial chairmanship and his concern for the ladies. While I formally acknowledge his welcome on their behalf, I am sure the ladies will find an opportunity to thank him and Mrs. Lattimer for the special programme which has been arranged.

These words of thanks would not be complete without a final word of appreciation to all those institutions and governments in Europe and elsewhere, who, in a time of great stress and financial difficulty, have generously made it possible for members from overseas to attend. As one of our members expressed it to me, this influx of foreign visitors to this country must be counted in the export trade of Canada. They must accordingly be counted in the import trade of

their own countries, and, when the surmounting of import trade barriers is a matter of some difficulty in the world to-day, we must reckon ourselves fortunate that attendance at our Conference is viewed as a valuable item of trade. One of the last things I remember Dr. Warren saying to me was, 'For Heaven's sake, don't let the Conference at Quebec be a kind of American-British picnic. Try and see that it is truly international.' I am able to report to you that there are sixty members here from some twenty countries overseas. Those of you who know the state of the world to-day at first hand must agree that when governments, in the midst of those areas where the papers daily report rumours of wars, are willing to give facilities for so many delegates to attend, it is a gratifying sign of belief in our Conference and a hopeful indication that faith in true internationalism is not dead.

## OPENING ADDRESS

*By the President, L. K. ELMHIRST*

AS your President, my chief function in the periods between Conferences has been to attempt to prepare a programme on your behalf. For this meeting I have tried, therefore, to meet as many members as possible. Incidentally this has involved, in North America, two visits to Ottawa, to Washington, and to Cornell, and one to Chicago. In Europe it has meant personal journeys to sixteen countries. I should add here that the success of the tour in Europe was considerably enhanced by the subsequent visit of Dr. Booth from Ottawa, who travelled over much the same ground shortly after Mr. Maxton, Mr. Currie, and I had met the different groups of members.

The programme of our work for this week is the outcome of these journeys. It is divided into three parts. Four days are reserved for four separate but interrelated subjects, for each of which we have two principal speakers, and we have invited six leading men in each main field to take part in the discussion. We have fortunately been able to print and distribute the opening papers in each subject in order to facilitate discussion. We have next a number of what we have come to call 'non-discussion' papers. This does not imply that you are forbidden to discuss them. It simply means that they contain information of especial interest to those of you who are teachers or research workers which might give rise to a variety of questions, but are not intended to promote extended discussion. If you look back through the previous volumes of the Conference papers, you will find that in this way we are slowly building up a valuable body of factual knowledge from all over the world. One of our members said to me yesterday that if he were suddenly parted from the whole of his library, and had to take away with him only the books that he could put in one bag, he thought that he would choose our Conference reports. Now that, from a teacher of considerable reputation, was some compliment to these volumes, and it is one reason why we wish to have at every Conference a series of these non-discussion papers.

The third division of our time will be occupied by group discussions upon special subjects. This is one of the changes upon which Dr. Warren laid especial stress. He always emphasized that one of



our primary functions here is to enable specialists and research men to share and discuss their peculiar problems, to improve their technique, and to agree upon a common terminology, and therefore he was anxious that we should encourage the Conference to have sectional meetings. At Bad Eilsen we made a first experiment with one such group on currency and exchange problems. At St. Andrews we had a specialist group on the marketing of milk. This time we have considerably enlarged the number of these subjects by having two sessions in which three groups meet concurrently. There are, however, administrative difficulties. We cannot make the same adequate provision for translation and reporting as for our full conference sessions. I would emphasize that these group sessions are intended to provide a meeting-place for specialists in certain classes of work. The procedure will be quite informal, but in each group we have provided for a good chairman, an opening speaker, and a recorder to prepare a brief minute of the proceedings.

It would be enlightening, I think, for you to have some explanation of how the four main subjects found their way into the programme. They were selected after discussion with our members in many countries. I suppose the element in the titles which will be strangest to some of you who are keen specialists in the field of economics will be the word 'Social'. I would like to say here that the honours are about even between those who have criticized the President for allowing this word to be mentioned at all, and those who have commended him for introducing it. It looks from that as if somehow we have hit upon a very good basis for vigorous discussion, and this, after all, is what every Conference programme should offer to us.

Social anthropologists and others have begun to point out how wide a variety of social pattern exists in the world and how all these patterns tend to remain stable so long as their basic economic structure remains undisturbed. If this economic base is too suddenly or too drastically upset, the social pattern suffers all kinds of psychological stresses and strains because it still rests upon so many uncharted instincts and taboos, unconscious and subconscious emotions which delay and even prevent that free interplay of feeling and intellect that marks the study of economic forces and pattern. The sudden economic changes of the post-War era have left behind a legacy of psycho-social damage which it may take years of research and education to repair. In the main in rural areas we are to-day dealing with such a condition, since age-long unquestioned patterns of village and rural society are having to face the coming of the

machine and the pull of the great city. We recognize and appreciate the demand of disadvantaged rural folk for all that wide range of social services the city offers, whilst we must deplore our own failure to estimate the basic social and psychological values of rural community life, and regret we have so little alternative to offer.

When the anthropologist and the social psychologist urge a slowing down of disruptive economic change in order to give time for a more sensible social pattern to emerge, we can only admit that, in the pursuit of purely economic factors and research, we have refused to regard many of the social implications of economic policies we were pushing forward as our business or concern. This challenge to attempt a better synthesis with the sociologist, to adopt gentler, broader, more scientific, more sensitive, more psychological attitudes in relating our economic programmes to rural society, is one that we cannot refuse to accept for much longer. The social psychologist is beginning to turn his attention to patterns of rural as well as to patterns of urban life, and we may find in him an invaluable ally. I can think of two significant schemes of research going on at this moment, one at work on a village community in Poland, and another upon a larger community in Scotland. Close examination is being made of the psychological effects of economic changes that have come about through the disturbance in world conditions in the last few years. This disturbance has affected the traditional social structure of almost every country in the world. The work in Scotland is a rather special study into the psychological effects of unemployment on the unemployed and on the whole social pattern around them. It is being carried on not only by a psychologist, but by a historian, an economist, a doctor, and an educationalist. I give you this example because it is not going to be long before others of our social and rural problems will be tackled by co-ordinated groups of scientists. Economists everywhere seem to agree that steady social progress is impossible without economic development, and, on the other hand, that there can be no rapid economic development without social implications—and so I offer no apology for allowing the word 'social' to creep into our main subject programme.

However highly specialized the study and practice of agricultural economics is bound to become, can we refuse all responsibility for attempting to co-ordinate its findings with those of other sciences working in the same field and upon the same human society? Our Conference should surely give us a chance to take a bird's-eye view of the whole field of rural human activity, and to relate our own specialist enterprise to the other aspects of the same field in a

balanced and intelligent manner. The necessity of so doing was forcibly brought to my attention during my recent tour in Europe, from which I will give you one or two illustrations. We were in Hungary soon after a law had been passed forbidding the use of any labour-saving devices or machinery on the farms. You on this side of the Atlantic may smile. But if you were in Hungary to-day, with conditions as they exist, you would realize the difficulty of the position in which the Government is placed, and the kind of problem with which it has to deal in its rural areas. On one experimental station, a fruit farm, we were bidden to look at the finest fruit-tree sprayer yet put on the market. 'Of course,' our guide said, 'this machine is only for showing to students and not for use.' Again, in Bulgaria, we toured a country where over 75 per cent. of the whole population is engaged in agricultural enterprise as compared with 7 per cent. in Great Britain. Their chief problem is how, in such a country, to raise the standard of living of the peasant population. I was surprised and delighted to find how solid a basis Professor Molloff's institute and Professor Anderson's statistical bureau offer for working out sound principles for tackling such a difficult economic and social problem. Bulgaria's chief difficulty is that she has only rural primary products to sell. How is she to raise the standard of living of people who need more roads and schools, and all kinds of expensive social services, unless her people are enabled to exchange their food products for the machinery and manufactured articles they want?

Many other similar cases were brought to my attention during the tour, where social and economic problems were inextricably linked together. In Denmark, for instance, there are a quarter of a million farms, for the most part—as you know—family farms, and some two hundred thousand labourers. One does not ordinarily think of Denmark as a country where farm labour is employed, but these are mainly young men, sons of farmers, who are hoping one day to operate a farmstead of their own. How is that demand for farms to be supplied? Farms of only one hundred acres are still being broken up at a considerable rate in order to maintain a social pattern in which the Danish country people profoundly believe, even though this smaller holding may not be of an economic size to support a reasonable standard of living. In Sweden the movement from the land to the towns gathers increasing speed. So many young girls leave the farm for the city, we were told, that a considerable import trade has developed in single young ladies from Finland who come over to marry the Swedish farmers left behind on the farms. Latvia

and Germany are both dependent on importing a considerable body of labour to work on the farms, from lower standard of living regions. Under such conditions how is it possible to build up a satisfactory economic and rural life? As a final illustration of how the rural social pattern can be affected by economic change I may mention that we have lost 20 per cent. of the agricultural labouring population of Devonshire (England) in the last five years. They have gone to the towns in search of the better houses, shorter hours, higher pay, and wider provision of social services than the countryside can afford.

If we want to begin to study these problems, can we any longer treat the economic aspects and the social in separate compartments? The suggestion in the titles on the programme is not that all the economists should turn into sociologists (God forbid), or that sociologists should all try to become economists (again, God forbid), but that each of us now and then should look up from our specialist research work and glance over the garden wall at what the other fellow is doing with the same basic materials. We might then begin to think a little more in terms of co-ordination and synthesis. For, although the economist may be well advanced in his study of agriculture and its related sciences, we must remember that following hard on his heels come the biologist, the anthropologist, the nutrition expert, the psychologist, the historian, and the gentleman for whom I have not found a name—he is the man, I hesitate to call him an aesthetist, who is beginning to look into the arts and the whole artistic and leisure side of the life of rural people, and to point out what an important aspect this is of a wholesome existence. Now, unless we are going to fall into the kind of general discussion that used to occupy the theologians in the past, and that still occupies many of our economic 'theologians' to-day, we must take steps in advance to explore the field where social and economic factors interlock. That is why, in three of the main subjects of discussion, the word 'social' is introduced into what is primarily an economic aspect of rural life: 'Social Implications of Economic Progress in Present-Day Agriculture', 'Land Tenure and the Social Control of the Use of Land', 'Farm Labour and Social Standards'. This, by the way, is the first Conference in which a session has been given to the subject of labour on the farm, and this fact in itself is a healthy sign of the times.

The continuous rise in the standard of living among rural populations all over the world, that we are now beginning to demand from modern civilization, is not going to be possible without the close

co-ordination of all scientific work in social and economic fields. How can such a rise be achieved without some kind of balanced world economy? This is why our last main topic deals with 'International Trade in Relation to Agricultural Development'.

One of our chief problems to-day is the enormous increase in deliberate control of human effort and social relationship. In the days when *laissez-faire* was in the ascendancy, freedom to pursue individual economic ends meant too often that the social welfare of millions was left to the individual decisions of the few. Once the principle of *laissez-faire* is upset, is there any escape from the need for forethought and planning in every field of social and economic activity, if each individual is to have a chance to flourish? To-day we realize that such social factors as nutrition, health, housing, education, and leisure can no longer be regarded as the private affair of private philanthropy, but are part and parcel of the socio-economic responsibility of the modern state. Can we avoid any longer the attempt to link economic research with a wider understanding of the interplay of social and economic forces? Unless the mainly peasant populations of the world can exchange their products for the services, machinery, and goods of the mainly industrialized peoples, where are they to turn to escape from poverty and fear, and the exploitation that so easily accompanies a low standard of living?

Only yesterday I met one of our United States members who works in the Southern States, and he was telling me of conditions there and in some of the Northern Atlantic seaboard States he has just visited. 'What a disgraceful situation,' he said. 'All these people down in the Mississippi Valley are beginning to turn out the finished products that were yesterday produced by large factories now lying empty, and by skilled men and women now unemployed. On the North Atlantic seaboard people need the primary products which are being produced down in the Mississippi Valley, yet there seems to be no visible bridge to connect these two needs.' Now, if such a lack of co-ordination can exist within the borders of a single ordered nation, what cannot happen where all kinds of political boundaries and national ramifications divide people from people?

Coloured by this continuous interweaving of social and economic forces, the whole pattern of nature and man moves down the story of evolution towards an ever widening field and horizon of human consciousness, both in the world of feeling and of intellect. As this horizon widens, and as the specialization of our knowledge vastly increases, the need for that occasional attempt at synthesis that our

Conference offers becomes more and more necessary. Over specialization without synthesis leads inevitably to an ostrich-like refusal to face the challenge of the universe. Broad generalizations, on the other hand, whether in the social or economic field, without continuous detailed measurement and research, will lay us open to the charge of muddy thinking and woolly sentiment.

A last word about the opportunities that this Conference affords. One special characteristic hitherto has been the free play of objective discussion amongst friends; another has been a wide variety of social contact and experience. The papers and discussions will be printed in a book, but unless you can go away from the Conference with some freshness of vision, some new experience of human relationship, some vivid recollection of games and songs, and unless you use to the full all the facilities that this place provides, you will not acquire that fine and fruitful memory that remains with most of those who have attended Conferences in the past, and for whom the social side of our Conferences ranks very high. We should try to remember that the social pattern of our Conference is as important as its economic structure.