

The Budget—Mr. Blackmore

Beaty, page 147. Chiang Kai-shek was successfully blockading Shanghai and Tientsin when Truman ordered the United States seventh fleet to "protect" him—see Utley, page 96. Truman thereby indirectly actually stopped him from blockading and most likely reconquering the Chinese mainland.

Do not the facts, Mr. Speaker, indicate that the Korean war might have been another step in the United States administration's long, sordid series of moves to eliminate Chiang Kai-shek?

If my conclusion is not right I invite all people who doubt the probability of my suggestion to explain certain things. First, Acheson practically invited the communists to take over South Korea and Formosa. At that time, on January 12, 1950, Acheson made it clear to the national press club in Washington that the United States would not go to the defence of either Formosa or Korea—see Utley, page 93. Is that not an invitation? Then there are those who blame North Korea for striking down into South Korea!

Second, on April 3, 1950, Acheson threatened South Korea with the withdrawal of United States aid—the same old story—if she did not balance her budget. Of course this meant that she must cut her military expenditures in preparation for defending herself against North Korean attack—see department of state bulletin, volume XXII, No. 563, dated April 17, 1950, page 602.

Third, the men Truman had sent into South Korea had permitted the South Koreans to make ready to defend South Korea only "to prevent border raids and to preserve internal security". These are Truman's words of June 27, 1950, as quoted by Utley at page 92. All this happened, notwithstanding the fact that on February 19, 1949, the Korean aid bill was passed by the United States, and in October a majority of the Senate appropriated \$10.5 million for arms aid for Korea! The United States administration neglected to deliver this aid!—see Utley, page 92.

Fourth, when the United Nations called for troops, the United States refused to accept 33,000 of Chiang's best soldiers offered to them from Formosa, though no other nation offered troops in substantial numbers—see Beaty, page 147.

Fifth, the use of the United States seventh fleet: 1. Released two communist armies to march up into North Korea to slaughter our boys and win South Korea, thus weakening Chiang's position. 2. Permitted great quantities of highly vital war materials to come up the Formosa strait to strengthen the Chinese communists, so they could come down to slaughter our boys.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Sixth, the United States administration, after all this, refused to allow General MacArthur to win!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think anyone who contemplates this recital of charges will recognize that we are in a chamber of horrors. When things such as I have indicated could be done by the United States administration in a way such as might threaten our very existence on this planet, and could put us in danger for no one knows how many years, it must strike almost anyone as being unbelievable. It is unbelievable until it is proven to be true, and it is proven to be true!

Now, in all our dealings with the United States we must bear in mind that probably, in large measure, the very same people who aided, abetted and directed in throwing China away are still in the American administration and will, if they get the opportunity, throw away Formosa just as they threw away China. Our efforts must be to strengthen those who would defend Formosa. For the communists want Formosa because, at the present time, Formosa is perhaps the most important strategic piece of territory on the face of this earth, so far as North America is concerned.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. W. Stuart (Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon the honest and courageous budget he brought down in this house about a month ago. It is a budget which seems to be accepted by the official opposition most reluctantly. As they have been unable to find anything in it to criticize they have gone back to the theme song they started last January, that of unemployment.

That was the criticism offered by the official critic of the Conservative party. I also heard his address over the radio, at which time he used the same theme. So it would appear that they could find very little in the budget to criticize. From the information we are given, however, in provincial representations which come to Ottawa, and by people we meet in different parts of the country, it would seem that these two groups are a long way apart in their estimation of unemployment in this country.

I quoted on one other occasion a statement made by a member in the Ontario legislature in which he said he had visited hundreds of homes in his own constituency, and could not find a single person unemployed. I am another who believes that the unemployment question is one which has been greatly exaggerated. Even though lack of employment for one person is serious, I think we