

I maintain that had it not been for Great Britain democracy for the rest of the world would have died.

However, in our relations there may be times when some irritation is revealed. May I compliment here and now the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) who, when speaking on this subject, asked us to be tolerant when discussing this matter, because it was a sensitive one. It is true that we have to be careful, because some people consider it only from the standpoint of dollars and cents. True, in any democracy dollars and cents must count; but at the same time I maintain that in our trade relations with Great Britain sentiment must always have its place no matter what some may say. We may have to exercise a good deal of sentiment if the day comes when liquidation of her debt to us is required. I repeat, without fear of successful contradiction, that some day they may find it impossible to meet all their obligations. Under these conditions, what would be the duty of the Canadian nation? It would be proper for us to forget about it, for the simple reason that Great Britain has paid in blood a price away beyond anything which can be counted in monetary consideration. She has paid in the lives she lost and the horrible tortures she had to suffer, not only among the personnel of her armed forces, people who had military training, but among her young children and her old people who were destroyed by tens of thousands when, for over eight months, the luftwaffe poisoned the skies of Great Britain.

We must not forget that situation, that great epic of heroism. While we may have done all that we possibly could, we must not forget that there may be times when Great Britain must do certain things from necessity. We too have international trade problems.

I do not believe in the iron curtain. It should never have been allowed to exist. Speaking not as an expert but as a Canadian, may I say that I cannot comprehend how it could be possible for Great Britain to hurt Canada by dealing with any nation within the iron curtain. My reasons are not only sentimental; I say that because a principle is involved. If the application of that principle is continued it may mean the doom of freedom and democracy as we know them.

In support of my opinion I should like to quote from an article which appeared in that fine weekly paper *The Ensign* of January 29, 1949:

Building on slavery.

This is worth listening to. It may be that Great Britain has a right to deal with other nations, but if Canada attempted to deal with a nation behind the iron curtain I would be

The Address—Mr. Bradette

the first to rise in my place and protest. The article reads:

The *Yorkshire Post* says editorially that one of the reasons Great Britain must buy food from Poland rather than from Canada—

We are all in sympathy with the fine Polish people. They do not like the communists, for they are not communistic by nature; but they are behind the iron curtain at the present time.

—is that the prices of her manufactured goods are too high to compete in North America. The editorial concludes that Britain must export more goods at present wage levels, but with cheaper raw materials than the new world can supply.

We have every sympathy with Great Britain's brave effort to restore her economy, which suffers from war wastage, from technical and mechanical obsolescence, and from currency dislocations. Nevertheless we are appalled by the implications of the Anglo-Polish and similar pacts when viewed in the light of the above reasoning. Reduced to their true significance, they mean that henceforth Britain's living standard is to be maintained, not by increased efficiency at home and unsharled trade abroad, but by the poverty, exploitation and expropriation of eastern European farmers by their communist slave masters.

Those are strong words, but I do not think anyone will dare deny them. Those who purchase from a country behind the iron curtain should know that they are buying goods that have been produced by political slavery pure and simple and by terrific sacrifices on the part of the people. The article continues:

We know from history that a soviet government will buy machinery and other finished goods needed for its "plans" at the expense of millions of starving peasants. It has been estimated that more than three and a half million peasants were deliberately starved in the thirties when their wheat was shipped abroad to buy equipment for Magnitogorsk, Dnieprostroi, and other projects.

Can Britain eat her bread with a good conscience when it is known that she buys it cheaper than in Canada because a ruthless dictator is exploiting his Polish slaves? Can the United States permit a dollar shortage which helps to produce such a situation? Does not this constitute aiding and abetting a crime against humanity? These are questions to be answered, for not even economic distress excuses transgressions against basic morality.

I speak very feelingly on this subject. After all, we can all remember the terrible blood bath through which Canada and Great Britain have passed in defence of democracy. We see now where trade balances and a monetary system have forced a great nation to deal with other nations inside the iron curtain. I am not going to go into the question of internationalism, for I have too much respect for our great friends to the south. I think the average United States citizen would like to see the dollar made more pliable, more humanized, so as to bring about freer trade throughout the world. The average United States citizen would like to see something done about the sterling situation. It would be a great humanitarian victory if there were