

all its idealism, the freedom and the liberty that they love so much, with their Christianity; their dynamic culture; I do not fear them. Surely it can be found possible for her to deal commercially with the rest of the world. How illogical it was for their statesmen after world war I to expect Great Britain to pay billions in war debt when they would not buy millions of dollars worth of her goods. The thing was economically impossible. These are the things the world must learn if we want to avoid the economic wreck that occurred after world war I. If every country erects a Chinese wall of tariffs almost sky-high, only one thing will result.

We Canadians are in a happy position. We want no aggrandizement of our territories; we do not want to enlarge our frontiers; we do not want the last pound of flesh. Therefore our voice should be clear in this thing. We should say to the world, not only through British preference, not only through multi-lateral trade agreements, but by every means possible that there should be more and more free trade in every section of the world. Before the war, when I heard that Germany wanted to fight because she could not get raw materials I did not want to believe that because it sounded so foolish. Surely it should have been possible for a nation like Germany to get the necessary raw materials. Surely after this war it should be possible for nations like Germany or Italy or all the other nations to have access to the raw materials of the world. Again I repeat that if we go into the same kind of foolish nationalistic and selfish economy that we had after world war I we shall fall again into the same situation that we had to face in the past.

I have hope, because the nations have learned, and through pressure from the people the governments must of necessity act. In the United States at the present time there is a great school of thought among workers, manufacturers and financiers, which realizes the viciousness that exists in high tariffs.

I come now to the matter of economy. There is no doubt that no hon. member on this side of the house wants extravagance, wants the people's money to be wasted, squandered. After all, we are just as responsible as are hon. members of the opposition. Let us be fair with ourselves. When I was Deputy Speaker, I think it was in 1944, for two weeks I tabulated the cost of the requests made by the opposition and I quit when I reach \$2,000 million. The same opposition were also asking for curtailment of expenditures. Those who were most vociferous were the Progressive Conservative party. I should like to quote a few short sentences from the

Financial Post, which is not an enemy of the Conservative party. They criticized that party's attitude in parliament as being the biggest political riddle heard in Ottawa in a long time and they referred to the leader of the opposition's statements that:

1. Old age pensions could be raised.
2. Radio licence fees eliminated.
3. Agricultural floor prices increased.
4. Veterans treated more generously.
5. Income taxes reduced one-third and exemptions raised.

If all those things were done it would have meant an increase of \$650 million in the budget. A short time ago the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) was pleading for the beet sugar industry. I should like to see the government do all it possibly can for that industry. Then I hear other hon. members talk about maritime rights and freight rates. I should like to see all those things implemented. But again you must cut your sails according to the cloth you have. If the government had had a deficit of \$200 million or \$300 million we would have heard, and how vociferously, from the opposition. We must be absolutely realistic when we are dealing with financial matters, and the opposition should at least be consistent on this question.

I should like to say a few words about the gold mining industry, which is an important industry in my section of the country. However, I am a realist, and when a gold producer comes to me and says that he cannot produce gold for less than \$38 or \$40 an ounce, I tell him to forget about it. I am not in favour of subsidizing the gold mining industry, but at the same time I feel that that industry was not treated fairly when the Canadian dollar was brought back to parity last year. This was one industry that was singled out, and the then minister of finance knew that because he mentioned it specifically. When we deal with this question let us be practical.

We allowed some marginal gold mines to function for three and a half to four years with a premium of \$3.50 an ounce due to the exchange difference between Canadian and United States dollars. Those people did not know how long that situation would exist. You cannot blame them for being optimistic. They thought it would exist for a period of years, that possibly ten or perhaps fifteen years would pass before the Canadian dollar would be at par with the United States dollar. Those people were allowed to go ahead producing.

The gold mining industry has always responded to any requests made of it by the federal government. Early in the war the then Minister of Finance made an appeal to the gold mines to produce as much as they