

clare that Liberalism stood for liberty, and even the Premier himself declared that the platform of the Liberal party was exactly the same as the platform of the Progressive party, that Liberalism, in fact, stood for progress. Yet this party of liberty and progress has closed up the last gap of liberty that the consumers of this country had left open to them. What pressure was brought to bear between the date of the budget speech, May 23, when the Finance Minister declared that this clause was to be left out as it was an unnecessary interference with trade, and June 22nd, when it was revived by the Minister of Customs? I do not know; but it must have been something worth while that could turn practically the whole Liberal party at one stroke into a body more Tory in its actions than even the Conservative party itself, and quite as amenable to the same influences that dictated that measure in the first place. Outside of the explanation given by the Minister of Customs at that time, no argument was made in behalf of that clause, except a statement by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), who reminded the right hon. leader of the Opposition that they had slaughtered him anyway.

The Tariff Act as it stands is perhaps the most vicious piece of legislation that has ever stood on the statute books of any country in modern times. I question if there is anything quite so complete of its kind anywhere else in the world. As it stands it has closed up the trade activities of one of our largest co-operative companies, and an attempt was made this year to bring the United Farmers of Ontario under its deadly ban. Is this the kind of Liberalism that the Progressive party is invited to join? It is true that two who were with us last year are with us no more, but are now sitting on the other side. I have no word of reproach for these men, but rather pity, and it is indeed pitiful to think that they have failed to grasp the ideal underlying the formation of the Progressive movement. It is pitiful that after being elected to support Progressive principles, and after sitting for one whole session with us here and in our caucus they should have failed to realize their obligations to their constituents. They must present a pitiful spectacle to those who elected them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. EVANS: Since they have failed to realize their obligations to their electors, and failed to realize the principles on which they were elected, it is well that they have changed sides. They will be more at home over there. I cannot understand, Mr.

[Mr. Evans.]

Speaker, a political party apart from a group of men who have gathered themselves around a set of principles so that, acting together, they might propagate and put those principles into practice. Whatever party is in power there are certain attributes of government that ought not to be overlooked. These are four in number—justice, legality, publicity, liberty. Justice denotes that no citizen or class shall usurp power prejudicial to the interests of any other citizen or class. Legality implies that every enactment shall have the sanction of law. It is hard to think that in these enlightened times in this country, any measure should be made legal without any regard for justice or liberty. Liberty implies that every citizen should have the privilege of asserting his individuality, for his own or his fellows' welfare, in any way which is not prejudicial to the rights of others. Yet the Tariff Act, with the amendment before mentioned, actually deprives one class of its right as citizens, and gives another class the right by law to exploit them. Under legislation of this kind we cannot wonder that the cost of living does not fall with the cost of farm produce or natural products. To-day there is actually no relation between the price of raw material and that of the finished article in the case of anything produced in Canada. Take for instance hides with harness, wool with clothing and blankets, wheat with flour and bread. They have actually no relation in price one to the other. I was in England last summer and stayed a few days at Ealing, one of the suburbs of London. I saw there a four pound loaf actually distributed at the homes of the people for eight pence half penny. That is sixty-four ounces of bread for seventeen cents. To-day in cities in western Canada we are paying seventeen cents for forty ounces of bread, or twenty-four ounces less for the same price. And speaking of flour, Sir, a gentleman who was asked last year to head the wheat board refused to do so for the reason that the control of flour was not given in the legislation creating the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say who that was? I do not wish to press him for the information if he would rather not give it.

Mr. EVANS: I would rather not say. However, he gave the reason I have mentioned, I can vouch for that. Now, we grant our millers an advantage of 60 cents per barrel protection on flour. Under this protection they enjoy a monopoly of the home market, while their large export trade is carried on in com-