

*External Affairs*

There is one important thing to bear in mind in considering this situation of the bringing in of these substances and raw materials from other nations. When other nations export their minerals such as aluminium they deplete their own resources. No nation can continue indefinitely to export its vital minerals and deplete its resources for coming generations. To what extent then can we balance our economy with the United States or other nations by sending to the United States these vital minerals which our own children are going to need? Furthermore, when a country exports its primary products, as we do when we export cattle or barley, what we actually do is to send raw materials with which the United States can manufacture goods and probably sell them back to us, making money in the process. Any nation that engages in the wholesale selling of primary products and the buying of manufactured products from abroad soon makes itself a hewer of wood and drawer of water. We have an example of that within Canada. The four western provinces have been obliged to send their raw materials, their primary products, to markets in the two central provinces to be manufactured, and what has happened? The four western provinces have become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the two central provinces of Canada, and that is exactly where they will stay until they industrialize.

Another aspect of the whole question is that not only do the United States tend to self-sufficiency but they tend to be determined first of all to distribute through foreign trade. President Roosevelt said in a great speech over the radio in October, 1944, that he intended to find jobs for sixty million Americans by trebling exports abroad. They are determined to send more and more exports abroad. What for? To bring money into the United States to buy their own goods. That is exactly the policy that Canada tries to follow, but it just does not work, and besides that it tends to destroy other nations.

In addition to that, the United States people, just the same as the Canadian people, have a fanatical attitude towards money. The Secretary of State for External Affairs and the leader of the opposition no doubt have the same attitude. They are completely fanatical about money. They will not even give consideration to the idea of creating money debt-free and using it for the benefit of their nation. They will not give a minute's thought to it, no matter how scientific it may be. The result is they abuse the minds of the people all over the country in this regard, and consequently there is apparently no hope in the world for the bringing in of that reform at least for a long time. The United States

[Mr. Blackmore.]

is not going to adopt the only method which she could adopt to solve her problem under the circumstances, namely, the distribution of purchasing power by social credit within the nation to buy the goods which she can produce, thus raising the standard of living of the whole nation and finding markets at home. She will not adopt that course. She shows no indication of intending to do so. There is not much hope of relief in that direction.

The United States also tends to a policy of non-discrimination, which means unconditionally the most-favoured-nation policy of the United States which was introduced in 1922, as a result of the application of which she forced world war II, and particularly forced the Japanese into war. That statement can be completely documented, and before anyone questions it I suggest that he had better write to me and get the documentation, because it is on record. The unconditional most-favoured-nation clause in the hands of the United States has caused more trouble in the world in the last thirty years than any other one thing that you can name, and she is not giving it up. Then we have our Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) coming into the House of Commons and telling us that he believes in non-discrimination which just renders it utterly impossible for have-not nations and weaker nations to live.

For example, let us see how it worked out in Great Britain. She came to the United States to borrow money after the close of world war II because they cut her right off lend-lease, and the United States in the course of the years during which Great Britain was spending that loan forced Britain to buy a lot of useless Yankee books instead of important things like the cotton that Great Britain wanted to buy. They forced the British people to buy a lot of tobacco from the United States when they could have just as well purchased their tobacco from Rhodesia and paid for it in their own goods. That is non-discrimination running wild. That is exactly what is in the minds of the United States officials. It means a lot to us in our external policy.

Furthermore, the United States tends towards an expansionist policy. They are not quite satisfied with the great big share of the world they have. They want to get still more and more, and monopolize markets in various parts of the world to the exclusion of other nations which absolutely must trade in order to get the things they need. What does that mean? There was a good example of it just recently in the newspapers. We are told that just recently France has had to adopt protective measures to protect her wine