

*Supply—Trade and Commerce*

say that I read the other day that Germany was going to be given the opportunity to come into the Bretton Woods agreement. From the way that was so gracefully put, I gathered the impression that Germany was told she would have to accept the Bretton Woods agreement. If you want to know why the dangerous situation exists in Germany today—one which may wreck us in a short time—go look for it, I suggest, in the Bretton Woods agreement and in the unconditional most-favoured-nation clause which Germany would presumably have to accept if she became a member of the comity of nations which we are pleased to call the "free" nations associated in the thing we call NATO. If what I am saying in this connection is not true, I invite anyone to put me right.

What is the situation when it comes to providing dollars to Great Britain to buy goods from America—Canada or the United States—or when it comes to providing France or any other country in the world with dollars with which to buy our goods? First of all, we are going to produce our own goods—which is a sound policy and one which I have commended the minister for—so we do not want their goods. They therefore cannot get our dollars, no matter how they try. Does that not sound hopeful to them? Does it not sound hopeful to us when we come to contemplate finding a market for our surplus agricultural products?

In addition to that, we are hedging ourselves about with an unconditional gold standard under Bretton Woods, binding in a strait-jacket every nation in the world which accepts it; and we are insisting on the unconditional most-favoured-nation clause doing all the damage the other measures did not do. One could almost repeat the old prayer that our fathers used to sing: "We have done those things which we ought not to have done and we have left undone those things which we ought to have done; verily there is no health in us."

We can recede from that position. We can denounce the Bretton Woods agreement and everything it stands for. Let us do that.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Blackmore:** Oh, yes; and I will defend that stand at the greatest possible necessary length. Those who do not see the soundness of my position do not realize what this Bretton Woods agreement means. I will suggest to the hon. member that he read my speech of May 5 in which I quote authorities that even he will not dare to question, no matter how bright, intelligent and well informed he is. Let us denounce the whole policy of the most-favoured-nation

clause. It is pernicious. It is based on the principle of non-discrimination in a world where the greatest nation in it, or what has been the greatest nation, reached that position by persistent and incessant discrimination, a policy that she proposes to follow to the *n*th degree. She imposes it on everybody else but she will not impose it on herself.

What do we need to do? The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart kindly asks me to repeat once more. Last year, two or three times, I advocated that Canada advance a line of credit to Great Britain of \$1 billion a year for five years. That would provide Britain with Canadian dollars. That would enable Britain to buy the goods we have to sell. That would enable us to sell everything we could produce in the way of goods Britain needs, including all kinds of agricultural products, all kinds of fishery products, all kinds of food, clothing, shelter that we produce. We could sell them to Britain as fast as we could produce them and in as great quantities as we could produce them. We could sell not only what we can now produce but what we could come to produce. It would also enable us to sell those goods at a price which we need to sell them at, having produced them in Canada which has a high standard of living.

The United States could have a similar arrangement. If they lent billions of dollars between 1920 and 1928, they can go on doing the same thing. The question then arises: where are you going to get the money? I am going to repeat one thing more which many hon. members in the committee will not accept, but I warn them that if they do not accept it, they take a fearful responsibility for the welfare of the people of the world. Yes, I know there are many people who laugh and who are not a bit concerned about the chaos we are going through. They do not laugh about a terrible war. The hon. member opposite waves his hands in a perfectly ridiculous way. He does not mind driving the country into a depression for five, six, seven or eight years. He does not mind going to war or subjecting the people to five or six years of war. But when it comes to adopting a new idea financially, he cannot do that.

**The Chairman:** Order. Perhaps, I might suggest to the hon. member that this is not the time to discuss financial methods or schemes. I would therefore ask him to confine his remarks to trade and commerce.

**Mr. Blackmore:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But the question Your Honour needs to ponder between now and tomorrow, or the next time he comes in, is how we can carry