

trade in commodities being passed to and from Great Britain. While it is true that after that both parties agreed with the policy, that did not alter the fact that those of the Conservative point of view—I have not any great criticism of them for holding that point of view other than to say that it tends to retard reform—have always tended to hold on to the things they have just as long as they possibly can. Then when they find they cannot hold on any longer, and the great majority of the people are in favour of it, they come in and agree. I said the other day when the leader of the socialist party—I say that advisedly—socialist party, not socialistic party—

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Cooperative Commonwealth Federation to you.

Mr. GARDINER: I hope my hon. friends are not becoming ashamed of the term "socialism".

Mr. CASTLEDEN: We are not, but you call us national socialists.

Mr. GARDINER: I sometimes believe that they are. Every piece of socialistic or social service legislation which has been brought into this house, and almost every piece of socialistic or social service legislation which has been brought into the provincial legislatures of this country, have been brought in by a Liberal government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not true. What about workmen's compensation?

Mr. GARDINER: You can make a speech some other time. I have listened to you saying a lot of things I thought were not true. The other day I said across the floor of the house that if our hon. friends of the socialist party had joined the Liberal party they would be farther away from Toryism than they are in the socialist party, and they questioned me. Every student of history in this country knows that Conservatism, or to go back beyond Conservatism to Toryism, had its birth in an attempt to hold the land and everything else in Great Britain under the ownership and control of the crown. In other words, the ownership of property and everything else in the original days following Norman rule in Britain was based upon the principle of state ownership. The whole battle between Liberalism and Toryism in Britain was a battle against state ownership and control. For that reason I say that when our hon. friends, in order to obtain what they consider to be reforms, base their ideas upon that of state ownership, it is a retroactive step and not a progressive one

that they are attempting to take. I believe that the Progressive Conservatives of to-day are more advanced Tories than are the socialists.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a kind of left-handed compliment.

Mr. GARDINER: That brings me to this. We have only the Liberalism left. These other groups who are claiming credit for everything that has been brought forth in this session under the name of Liberalism either do not know their history or are simply attempting to occupy the position which the Liberal party has occupied throughout the history of this country and throughout a considerable part of the history of Great Britain.

I am quite sure that in spite of the fact that they have had some encouragement—this applies more particularly to our hon. friends opposite to the extreme right—they should again read the history of this country. One has only to look back a few years to find the time when we had only one representative from Saskatchewan; one has only to look back to the same year to find that there was not a single representative of the Conservative party from that province; yet in the intervening period there has not been a member who was associated with the group which at that time swept the province elected to this house. In other words, there are certain principles related to the carrying on of government which abide in spite of all the intervening attacks that are made upon them. One of the principles which have remained in the minds of a great many people in this country is the principle which has established Liberalism, not only in Great Britain, not only in this country, but in the Atlantic charter and every other great charter that has been drawn up as a result of the activities of this war.

When I say that I give answer to the question asked me by the hon. member for Lethbridge, in which he associated himself with the hon. member for Lake Centre. The Liberal party does not believe and never has believed that we could advance the welfare of the human race by producing all the things that are necessary to our existence within the bounds of our own country. We have never believed either that we should produce an economy in this country or in any other country where all the activities should be associated with the production only of things that we ourselves require and want and need.

The hon. member for Lethbridge would like to know why we are not more concerned about the production of rubber, why we are not