

clusion that at the present time the government of any country under the system under which we operate has no effective control over its distributive machinery.

There is another difficulty. Money, in so far as it gets out to people, reaches them through wages and salaries. The only access which the ordinary individual has to money or to distribution is through his wages or salary. As machinery increases, and as technological skill develops, the number of people who are required to operate the productive machine progressively decreases, with the result that unemployment arises, which means that the distributive machinery is again seriously impaired.

There is yet another difficulty—and this has a particular bearing upon the Atlantic charter and all the glowing promises of freedom from want and fear. Up to the present time, if goods are to be distributed from the United States, for example, let us say to Timbuctoo, so as to be completely harmless in our remarks, the only way in which that distribution can be made is through Timbuctoo sending goods to the United States to pay for the goods it receives. This means that no matter how much Timbuctoo may need the goods of the United States, if Timbuctoo has not acceptable goods to pay for them it cannot get them, which again means that the United States is forbidden to distribute to Timbuctoo by reason of the laws of our present distributive machinery. That is an exceedingly serious matter. Regardless of how much the President of the United States may desire to help Timbuctoo's people, the only way in which he can overcome the difficulty is probably by giving them the goods outright. How that can be accomplished we need to study.

Any nation with meagre resources or with a large population is placed under an exceedingly serious handicap in this world when it undertakes to get goods which come from a nation that is abundantly endowed with resources and richly equipped with industrial machinery, as a result of which it can manufacture a wide variety of goods. The more such a rich country can manufacture the less it wants to buy from abroad.

One more serious difficulty is that the cost of secondary products or manufactured products tends to increase progressively, and that the price paid for primary production, such as that of wheat and meat, tends to decrease progressively. We see this well illustrated in our own Canadian west where the farmers to-day are obliged to pay, for 147 articles which they require, 152·8 per cent of what they had to pay for similar goods in 1914, and

[Mr. Blackmore.]

at the same time, except for the influence of the war which is transitory, they must accept less for their own products. This means that the primary producing area, nation or part of a nation, runs increasingly into debt to a secondary producing area. This truth has an exceedingly important bearing on all the proposals for the establishment of unity of nations, the removal of tariffs and trade restrictions, and all the rest of it.

May I turn now to the leader of the opposition and ask him earnestly to examine during the next two or three days all that emanated from Winnipeg and to say whether in all of that he finds anything whatsoever that goes to the root of this distribution problem. May I ask him two or three other questions in the most earnest and sincere way—for I have no desire to play politics. I am just an ordinary Canadian with children growing up in this country, who I suppose will be represented by grandchildren, and I really do want to see some reform made in Canada before everything goes to ruin.

The hon. gentleman said that he stood for the conscription of industry without telling us what that means. He said that he stood for the conscription of finance or the mobilization of finance. I hope he will examine closely what I say in case I do not carry in my mind just what he meant to convey. What does he mean by the mobilization of finance? The Social Credit group in 1939, when the war broke out, declared in favour of the conscription of finance and pointed out what it meant by that term, namely, the taking over by the government of Canada of the power and function of creating the nation's money. It insisted that that money should be created debt free. I should like to know what the leader of the opposition means by the conscription of finance. Does he mean greater and greater taxation? If he does, heaven help us. We have already gone too far in that direction. Then what does he mean? I will ask him three or four searching questions. Does he mean by the conscription of finance that the government shall take over the power to create money debt free? If he does, then I know something about how I shall line up with respect to him. Does his party agree, for example, with the idea expressed by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) in the budget debate last year when he advocated state-created debt-free money and when he elicited from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) such a sound scolding? Does the Progressive Conservative party agree with the views advanced by the hon. member for Parry Sound, or does it agree with the views