returned fifty-one Social Crediters out of fifty-seven members in the legislature, the Lethbridge *Herald*, together with other sections of the Liberal press across the country, shouted to high heaven that the province of Alberta was going to the dogs because what was needed most was a good strong opposition.

After the election of last June they turned around, and in several different editorials they bemoaned the fact that the people of Alberta had not seen fit to add to the 193 Liberals who had already been elected. They wondered why it was that the people of the province did not vote Liberal, why it was that they were so crazy as to vote anything but Liberal. The fact is that the people of Alberta did not vote Liberal, and the reason is quite obvious. The province of Alberta has been enjoying the kind of good government under the Social Credit party that makes it unnecessary for them to change to any other party.

I want to pay a high tribute to the government of Mr. Manning in Alberta. It is being recognized more and more every day that through wise policies of management of resources and finance and of the affairs of the people they have brought that province to the forefront of the provinces of Canada. Because the people there are happy and contented, not even the presence of Santa Claus along with several other forces that came into the province with the Liberals could help those Liberals win against the Social Credit government in the province and the Social Credit feeling.

We have here ten good men and true, men who know exactly where they want to go, men who stand together. Furthermore they are men who have not sold their independence. They are men who are prepared to fight for the independence of the people of this country. I say to you that if this country needs one thing more than another it is more independence and independents in this House of Commons.

Let me refer just briefly to something which the press evidently has overlooked. Those who have been guilty of attempting to influence the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), and the Speaker of this house, so as not to recognize the so-called splinter parties, should realize that the tree of liberty has not yet been so firmly rooted in the soil of this country or of any country in the western hemisphere that adverse winds cannot blow it down. No one denies that there are winds and storms about. Therefore we are still in need of increased faith, of vigilance, of work, of the will to fight and sacrifice in order to ensure that this old tree is kept standing and growing and putting forth new branches.

Our fathers fought and bled and died to establish freedom and personal liberty in this country. They fought and bled and died to secure for us the right to speak our minds freely, to worship Almighty God in our own way and in our own churches, to take part in our own government and to live our lives as individuals and not as members of regimented groups. I say to you that if our attitude toward these freedoms that have been so dearly bought becomes careless, then they will depart from us just as surely as darkness comes upon the earth with the setting of the sun. It is for that reason that I feel that the newspapers who sponsored this drive across the country have insulted the intelligent people of Canada who value their freedoms and who are determined that they shall continue to exercise them and to have as many parties as they want.

I do not say that I support the idea of a multiplicity of parties, but I say that if the people of this country want to organize in a democratic manner for high purposes that are perfectly out in the open and not in any way subversive, that is their right and no newspaper nor any pip-squeak newspaper writer ought to be allowed to interfere with that right.

I should like to say just a word about this most important matter of the devaluation of the pound. I think I am safe in saying that this whole matter is so complicated that perhaps no one man can grasp at once the whole significance of it, nor can anyone say what may be the results of the action that was taken by Great Britain last Saturday. So many factors are involved, including the human factor. If we could anticipate what organized labour will do under the impact of devaluation or what reactions may be expected from capital and from the United States exporters and industrialists, perhaps we would have some idea of the outcome of the present action taken by Great Britain. But I think we can see ahead clearly enough that a few words of warning might not be out of place at this time.

As a result of all the evidence that is available, I believe that we are justified in drawing certain conclusions. In the first place, Great Britain did not devalue the pound sterling voluntarily. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that Great Britain was bludgeoned into it just as she has been bludgeoned in other ways in recent years, including Bretton Woods. I have noted the repeated statement by Sir Stafford Cripps that Great Britain would not resort to the devaluation of the pound, a statement that was repeated right up to the day that his vessel came into the harbour of New York when he was on his