

*Supply—Trade and Commerce*

form an Atlantic community in the western world. We recognized the possibility and necessity, through the formation of this organization, for co-operation amongst the free nations. The member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization agreed, under article 2, as follows:

The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

It seems to me that pursuant to that definite agreement between the North Atlantic Treaty nations we should impress every member with the importance of promoting economic collaboration between all members of the organization, including the United States and the United Kingdom. The importance of such co-operation is recognized now in Europe. In spite of all their past rivalries, in spite of all their past troubles, the peoples of Europe are moving towards free trade between themselves. Most people would have thought it impossible that these people, with the background of their history, could have thought of having a common market between them. It seems to many observers that they are moving steadily and surely towards a common market for the peoples of western Europe.

What is Canada's response going to be in this matter? We have not the great consuming area the United States has. Here is a possibility of entering such an area. If a great economic free trade area in Europe is set up and we enter into some agreement with the United Kingdom, ultimately we would share in the benefits of the great consuming area of western Europe. It would put us in a position to make possible industrial and other development.

I suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that there comes a time when people have either got to go forward into the future or back and go through the difficulties of the past. We are now moving out of the period we went through during and following the second world war. Are we going to benefit by this experience? If we realize we have to live together as nations we should move towards freer trade, otherwise we are going to make the same mistakes all over again.

It seems to me this government should have followed the role that has been followed by the Canadian government over the last 20 years. We were one of the main proponents and originators of GATT, the general agreement on tariffs and trade. It was our

government that was one of the originators of NATO. Our government has always tried to stand for an extension of trade, for the opening up of markets. This, of course was the basis upon which we could hope for real development.

I do hope that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce goes back to Great Britain he will realize that if he is going to do what he should do as a representative of the Canadian government in the matter of trade he has to do more than go around trying to place orders with British industries. He has to take a constructive attitude towards this most imaginative proposal of the British government. If he does that, then we are taking a step forward by which there is some real hope for the western world and for us.

I wish to say a word or two about our wheat situation. I suggest that this is all part of the same picture. Undoubtedly the United States is following a policy of getting rid of her billion bushel surplus of wheat by any means necessary. Some of the members may have seen a series of articles written by Jack Stepler of the *Herald's* London bureau published in the *Calgary Herald*. He says in one of these articles that he has discussed the situation as he found it on a trip around western Europe with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I believe most members would find these articles very informative and very interesting. He went over there to find out what the situation was with regard to our disposal of wheat. One of the things he says, and I think most of us will agree, is that there is nothing wrong with our marketing machinery. Wherever he went he saw evidence of the good work being done by the wheat board, the good work being done by our trade commissioners and by everybody concerned with disposing of Canadian wheat. The trouble they were running into was the subsidies and the various policies of the United States government which was determined, at all costs, to get rid of its surplus wheat. In the article which appeared in the *Calgary Herald* of November 20, he says this:

A remark by the official in charge of Polish grain imports, made at a cocktail party in Warsaw, was a sharp and cogent introduction to the chief problem facing Canadian wheat exports to Europe.

"We buy from the United States because they sell cheapest and give us 20 to 25 years to pay."

Long-term U.S. credits, barter, price-slashing, subsidized sales and "gifts" linked with international power politics—coupled with strong pressure of the Washington wheat lobby to get rid of U.S. surplus stocks at any cost—are methods by which the United States has upset the world wheat market to the detriment of Canadian farmers and has invaded in recent years markets which have been traditionally Canadian.

The policy has been one which has been costly, because while the U.S. has maintained a high price