

Supply—Trade and Commerce

prospective purchasers of United States goods in order to keep her out of a depression. No matter what the Marshall plan cost it would not cost as much as a depression.

Canada, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar pointed out, shared rather munificently in the Marshall aid advances of the United States. It was a generous gesture on the part of the United States to permit us to do it. We did so, and as a result the Marshall aid system helped to provide us with markets.

The Marshall aid plan has rather run out so now the United States has adopted some sort of security measure. I forget the name of it.

Mr. Howe: The economic security administration. It takes the place of the Marshall plan.

Mr. Blackmore: I thank the minister. The name had slipped my mind. I did not expect to speak this afternoon and I am speaking extemporaneously. Now the United States has brought in the economic security administration with power to lend money indefinitely. For what purpose? Ostensibly the purpose is to help Europe but down at the bottom it is to help the United States to sell her goods. To show how intense is the United States' desire to sell her goods abroad, I call to witness her insistence that Great Britain shall buy shells, cartridges and all that sort of thing to equip her armies from the United States so as to give United States business firms a market, thus utterly disregarding the needs of Great Britain for similar markets. That is enough to show how the United States keeps her eye on the ball, and in her case the ball is getting markets abroad.

Mr. Hosking: She has given the money to start with.

Mr. Blackmore: She has given the money. She has given United States dollars, and by that means she is providing herself with markets.

Mr. Hosking: Then don't criticize her.

Mr. Blackmore: I am not criticizing. I am trying to get the Canadian parliament and everybody else to face the facts as they are and not try to build their theories on sand. Let us get down to bedrock and know what it is all about. For us to expect the United States to adopt a policy of strict non-discrimination in the light of the facts I am now giving is for us to be utterly unrealistic. The hon. member for Peace River has just referred me to an article on rubber. I have not had a chance to read it but he says that it supports the statement I was making concerning Malaya. What are we going to do if this new device the United States has adopted

[Mr. Blackmore.]

whereby she provides prospective foreign customers with the money with which to purchase her goods ceases to function? What is she going to do and what is Canada going to do?

There is one more thing the United States has done. I am not finding fault but I am mentioning it because I have already spoken several times in the house on this very subject. I spoke on April 2, April 9 and May 5 and followed a general line of thought based upon the fact that since 1922 the United States has enforced in the world the unconditional most-favoured-nation clause. The unconditional most-favoured-nation clause has impeded nations in their trade arrangements beyond all power to estimate, and she is still following the same policy. Why is she doing that? It is purely to provide her own producers with markets. She wants to bring about a condition where if any little nation in the world gives another little nation a favour, as the result of which that other little nation can get a market, the first nation has got to give the big powerful United States the same favour so she, the U.S., can go in there and sell her goods thus displacing the goods of the little nation being favoured. That is the meaning of the unconditional most-favoured-nation clause which prevails in the world, and in my opinion Canada fatuously committed herself to the unconditional most-favoured-nation clause because it was said that we want an expansionist program. The Minister of Trade and Commerce issued a pamphlet in 1945 in which he said that we favour expansion.

I discussed that on May 5 to some extent. I do not propose to go into it today but what it actually means is that the United States is free to expand indefinitely. By using all sorts of means she gets markets for herself all over the world regardless of what happens to the rest of the world. Thereby she exports her unemployment and dumps it on the streets of the other nations of the world by simply exporting her goods in every direction under the protection of the unconditional most-favoured-nation clause upon which she bases what her apologists are pleased to call "expansionist policy." Expansionist policy for the United States! And for the United States alone!

Another important factor is the Bretton Woods agreement which was designed to put every nation signing the agreement upon an unconditional gold standard. I discussed that matter in some detail on May 5.

What are we going to do about the whole situation? I say first of all let us get out of the Bretton Woods agreement just as fast as we possibly can, and get everybody else out of it. While I am on this point, may I