

be in conflict with the truth, must be supported by his principles, by his ideals, and by his company. I refer, of course, to his political principles and ideals. Let us see whether his principles and ideals are those of Liberalism. What is Liberalism? I have read somewhere that Liberalism is, in essence, the problem of realizing liberty. It seeks the setting free of the mass of the people in regard to self-government, trade, religion, education, and industry in all the manifold ramifications of society. The opposite to Liberalism is restriction, and means the centralization of government in the governing classes, the setting of the brakes on social progress and liberty. The aim of Liberalism is the common good: the aim of those opposed to Liberalism is the individual good. Gladstone said that the principle of Liberalism is, "Trust in the people, qualified by prudence." The principle of Unionism is mistrust of the people, qualified by fear. Mr. Asquith has said that "Liberalism is a living faith, a spirit, an attitude of mind, a form of political temperament and genius, a temperament, which, whenever it sees a wrong, would redress it absolutely, and wherever it discerns a cause for grievance anywhere would pluck that cause out by the roots." In three words I will give you, Mr. Speaker, my own conception of Liberalism: Masses versus Classes.

Now that we know what Liberalism is, let us see if the hon. Minister of Immigration has lived up to Liberalism. As a minister in the Unionist Cabinet, he is responsible constitutionally for all the acts of the Government, and constitutionally again, if he wishes to relieve himself of this responsibility his only course is to resign. Not having done so,—and there are no signs that he intends doing so—I logically surmise that all the measures of the Government have his approval.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to put my questions. Is the voting against a measure abolishing titles in Canada included in the Liberal doctrine? Will my hon. friend pretend that the War-Time Elections Act, breaking faith with thousands of citizens and dragging the honour of Canada and its fair name in the mud, is a Liberal measure? Is it the opinion of the minister that the Military Voters' Act, especially in view of the purpose for which it was used in the last election, is imbued with pure Liberalism? Was not the campaign of racial and religious prejudice carried out by the Government to which the hon. gentleman sticks like a leech any-

thing but Liberalism? Is the consolidation of the financial ring of Toronto, erstwhile denounced by my hon. friend, an action that he could call Liberal? Is the companionship of food profiteers and the benevolent paternalism of bacon earls fit for any one who still calls himself a Liberal? Are the instructions to the military officers to disregard the orders of the established courts in accordance with Liberal principles? Is the exemption of Victory bonds from taxation, which is nothing less than a camouflage enactment to protect those who have enriched themselves during the war from paying income tax, a Liberal measure? Can my hon. friend state, without wincing, that the censorship of the press and the gagging of independent opinion is pure Liberalism? Is not the censorship on publications, which goes so far as to make it a criminal offence for any one to have in his possession Plato's Republic, anything but Liberal? Is the wholesale buying of the press of this country for political purposes a Liberal measure? Is the incompetency and indifference to the welfare of the masses, as evidenced by the present high cost of living with no relief in sight, true Liberalism? Is my hon. friend aware that Liberalism stands for a just share by the working man in the profits of industry? Does my hon. friend believe that militarism in its most truly Prussian form can be regarded as an offspring of democracy? Will my hon. friend dare to contend that the forcible sending of men to Siberia without authorization of Parliament is in accordance with Liberal ideals? I should also like to know whether it was a Liberal sentiment which prevented representatives of the people from being called into counsel during the most momentous nine months in our history?

Does the flagrant abuse of the War Measures Act, passed at a very critical time, appeal to the Liberalism of my hon. friend? Is the Government of the people by Orders in Council, even when Parliament is sitting, considered by my hon. friend a Liberal measure? Did my hon. friend ever consider that the passing of Orders in Council, with retroactive effect, is in direct violation of the liberty of the citizen? Can the hon. minister contend that the operation of the War Measures Act, three months after the war is over, to liquidate a railway company, is up to Liberal standards?

At six o'clock the House took recess.