

The Budget—Mr. Blackmore

where would you stop? At the living standard of the Japanese, where they get less than ten cents an hour?

The leader of the C.C.F. group, speaking on a national broadcast on June 1, 1954, had this to say:

Within the last two weeks, the government has asked the tariff board to study the impact of preferential tariffs on woollen textiles imported from the United Kingdom. This announcement can have only one meaning—that the government is considering increasing the preferential tariff rate of this commodity imported from Great Britain. Let me immediately say that if this were done the C.C.F. would be strongly opposed to it.

That may well be the position taken by members in the C.C.F. group representing the prairie provinces, but I am convinced that the textile workers and organized labour in the industrial provinces of Ontario and Quebec could never subscribe to such a policy.

Many other industries are losing their Canadian market to imports from these low wage countries; to mention only a few, the machine tool industry, the electrical industry, the rubber footwear industry. Still others are suffering from competition with imports from the United States, where their large home market with a wall around it allows them to produce in such large quantities that our secondary industries in many cases cannot compete with them even in our own market. We have listened too long to members of the United States government give lip service to the principles of freer trade; then, as soon as any of their industries suffer from competition they immediately slap on quotas and use the escape clauses under GATT.

In conclusion I would ask the government to reconsider its decision, and before the new GATT agreement is signed to eliminate the 50 cents per pound maximum under tariff item 554b. I would also urge the government to see that we have the same escape clauses as any other signatory to the GATT agreement and if the United States or any other country wantonly uses the escape clauses against us, we should protect our own industries by the same method.

Mr. J. H. Blackmore (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, for many years now the world has been in the grip of a so-called cold war. A cold war is a war for men's minds, a war in which the aggressor seeks to talk his intended victim out of the possessions which he contemplates obtaining. The enemies of freedom, which comprise the communist conspiracy, subtly and with satanic skill and cunning, have been talking the world into confusion and into delusion in order to lead the democratic peoples into captivity, bondage, slavery and then destruction.

50433—220½

My purpose today is to discuss one of the techniques of that cold war that has been waged against the anti-communist world incessantly now since at least as far back as 1940. During that cold war the anti-communist peoples have sustained appalling losses, mainly through failing to recognize and realize what was happening to them. They are still in danger of losing, because they will not realize what is happening to them. For example, during the ten-year period ending with this year, in China alone 450 million potential friends of North America have been turned into 450 million potential and almost certain enemies of North America, by being delivered into the hands of Stalin and the political successors of Stalin in red Russia.

How came this dangerous occurrence about? United States citizens, acting either within the United States or under the direction of people in the United States, threw the Chinese mainland under the domination of the red rulers of Moscow. How and by whom has this been achieved?

May I suggest, as one of the figures eminently worth considering in this connection, Dean Gooderham Acheson, one-time secretary of state of the United States. Much confusion has been sown everywhere among anti-communist peoples through certain false statements of Dean Gooderham Acheson. Strangely enough, throughout this country and practically throughout the world this man is held in high esteem, which makes his falsehoods more dangerous.

May I invite the house for the time being to consider two of many examples of such false statements which I could readily name. Dean Acheson in 1949 said in effect that the United States could not in reason have prevented the outcome of the so-called civil war in China. No matter what she had done or left undone, he said, she could not have prevented the outcome. In his letter of transmittal to the white paper on "United States relations with China, 1949", Dean Acheson said:

The unfortunate but inescapable fact is that the ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the government of the United States. Nothing that this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities could have changed that result; nothing that was left undone by this country has contributed to it.

See Utley, page 31.

I think probably a bigger falsehood than that could not be found in modern times. Freda Utley, at page 30 of her highly scholarly and scrupulously documented book, "The China Story", published in 1951, writes:

No one who takes the trouble to study the records can accept Acheson's statement.