

put their gratuities into buying houses which they cannot get into. There will be a boom in the building trades for five years and then a slump.

In 1935, at my suggestion, the Bennett government appointed a committee of the house to inquire into housing and reconstruction. The committee made a study of the matter and its report was adopted. The money was lent through the banks at a low interest rate, and \$86 million was spent to build houses all over our cities. Only \$16,000 or less was lost in that venture. We should have a system like that now.

Who is going to do the building? Nobody wants to build except the government. It costs so much to build that the working classes cannot pay the rent asked. What about the materials for the houses and the price of those materials? What is the government doing about that? Nothing that I know of. The cost of materials is prohibitive and the materials are in short supply. That is why one of the leaders in the other place said that nobody nowadays wants to build a house or own one. What about the cost of the new houses and the rent of the temporary houses? On top of all that you have a control system which prevents anybody from getting into his own home. Yet we have money to spend like water all over the seven seas. Where are we getting the money to spend on the Olympic games overseas? Imagine 4,000 contestants going over there with the food, fuel, housing and shipping situation what it is. Do you not think the time has come to drop this government assistance and tell those who want to go to the Olympic games to pay their own expenses? But the government is providing \$17,500 for the Olympic games. It would be far better to drop the Olympic games until 1950 and let those who want to go pay for it—contestants, officials and people with badges—4,000 people. Where are you going to get these people housed in London, England? These games should be postponed until 1950 at least. That fine estimable Ottawa young lady would be far better advised to drop the Olympic games altogether and keep the car that was given to her. We should not vote money for the Olympic games because they cause more disunion than union. Hon. members will remember the riots and disorder at some of these contests in Europe in other years. It would be far better for Canada to have them in some large city—at the Canadian national exhibition.

I believe this budget should be criticized because it forgets all about the British empire. Our whole trade from the very start has been

based on our relationship with the empire. I quote what Sir John A. Macdonald said at Kingston in 1844:

I, therefore, need scarcely state my firm belief that the prosperity of Canada depends upon its permanent connection with the mother country, and that I shall resist to the utmost any attempt, from whatever quarter it may come, which may tend to weaken that union.

Forty-seven years afterwards, in February, 1891, he reaffirmed the same doctrine of our close relationship with the mother country, in these words:

For a century and a half this country has grown and flourished under the protecting aegis of the British crown. Under the broad folds of the union jack, we enjoy the most ample liberty, we govern ourselves as we please, and at the same time we participate in the advantages which flow with association of the mightiest empire the world has ever seen. As for myself, my course is clear. A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die.

That is the policy we should follow—the empire first, last and all the time. Trade should follow the flag, and the flag the trade. We should not give up the British preferences. My friends opposite and my friends to the left used to believe in free trade. They said that the grain trade should flow north and south instead of east and west to Britain and our allies, and the result was that on one occasion wheat went down to 38 cents a bushel. Mr. Fielding and Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1897 brought in preferential trade within the empire and the six cents preference on grain. That policy should have been continued but it was ended by Canada in 1938. But this budget forgets that, and forgets that we are part and parcel of the British empire. I was the only one on these benches who in 1945 voted against the Bretton Woods agreements because I saw the dangers of liquidating empire trade and preferences. I have always strongly supported preferential trade within the empire and shall continue to do so and I believe that a large body of public opinion supports it at the present time. The whole future of the mother country depends upon the dominions. Without the dominions the mother country will become a second Denmark at the edge of Europe, and we shall have little or nothing to say in the peace terms.

What did free trade ever do for the dominions or for the people of this country? As a result of British preferential trade 2,500 United States branch plants and affiliated industries have been established in this country, fifty per cent of them being manufacturing establishments and the others being engaged in finance, insurance, shipping and other services. Many of these branch plants