

to these great questions which affect the well-being of the masses of the people, which have to do with the prosperity of the country, which have to do with the interest of consumers: the less we let hon. gentlemen opposite divide the forces that have the interests of the people at heart, the better it will be for this Dominion of Canada. They are derisive because the government is bringing down a policy which appeals to hon. gentlemen of the Progressive party. From the moment that I had anything to do with public life in this country, I have tried to bring about unity between the forces that are making for the dominance of progressive and Liberal ideas in Canada, and I shall continue to strive in that direction. I say, too, speaking to my hon. friends of the Progressive party, that the only hope the Tory party in this country will ever have of getting back into power is that they can divide the forces that have the interests of the people at heart.

I have read what the Toronto Globe said in reference to my remarks in that regard. Remember that this was the campaign in which we were appealing to the people for support and these were the grounds we were putting forward when we asked the people to return us to parliament. The Mail and Empire of September 21 has the following:

The Liberal leader's tariff statement last night was simply a repetition of previous declarations of the Liberal policy of a "tariff for revenue." He went a little further, however, by admitting that he would revise the tariff to cheapen the means of production—his way of referring to a cut in the protection given machinery and farm implements manufactured here, and he would also use it to lower the cost of living by permitting freer import of foodstuffs.

The London Advertiser contains also a statement of what was said that night in very much the same words. The Toronto Star of September 21 had the following, taken from my speech of that evening:

There need be no mistaking the position of the Liberal party as regards the tariff. It regards the tariff not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end. That end, according to the Liberal policy, is three-fold, and is to be effected not by abolition of the tariff but by its revision.

First: its revision for purposes of revenue; this to be accompanied by making such revisions as are required to give greater effectiveness to the tariff, as one of the means of raising revenues necessary to carry on the government of the country.

Second: its revision for purposes of increase of production. This to be accomplished by facilitating more extended development of the industries based on the great natural resources of our country—agriculture, mining, lumbering, and fishing—by making the necessary instruments and implements of production available where possible at lessened cost.

Third: its revision for purposes of decrease of the cost of living. This to be accomplished through rendering possible increased production in the manner

already described and by making certain of the necessities of life available to the people at lessened cost.

From Toronto in that campaign I went to the city of Montreal where I spoke on the evening of September 22, and I take the following extract from the Montreal Star of September 1923:

...The issue is not between protection and free trade; it is what it has been in the past, between the old Tory party and the old Liberal party, an issue between high protection on the one hand and a tariff for revenue on the other. . . . But there is a great difference between having a tariff that has stood for many years and never changed and revising the tariff in the interests of the needs of the country as you see it. Mr. Meighen says the tariff needs revision; we say the same thing. The difference I can see is, were they to revise the tariff it would be revised in the interests of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers. If it is left to our revision it will be revised in the interests of the consumers and the producers, and this is the first interest to be considered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will give my hon. friend a little more; he will get all he wants. I shall quote next from the Moncton Transcript of September 23rd which gives a report of a speech I delivered at Sherbrooke in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. McCrea) who spoke in the debate a day or two ago.

Mr. King declared that the first need of Canada was true economy and a reduction in the cost of living. Revision of the tariff was overdue, but it should be downward revision in the interests of all classes.

The leader of the opposition read an extract from a report of my speech in one of the Sherbrooke papers. Well, I take the following from a press despatch to the Ottawa Citizen of September 24 reporting what I had said in Sherbrooke on this question of the tariff:

The Liberal party believed in cheapening raw materials by reducing the tax on implements of production.

The Liberal tariff was the only one which was equally fair to residents of both city and rural area alike. It was the policy which would bring about increased production, which was the need of Canada to-day.

The point I want to make perfectly clear is this, that I did not choose one centre in which to say one thing and another centre in which to say something different. If I felt that in any particular constituency some special question was likely to be raised at any time with respect to these matters I emphasized that particular point, and when I spoke in Sherbrooke I knew how my hon. friend on this side of the House felt in regard to tariff matters. I was therefore very careful to make it clear that as respects the instruments of production our intention was to reduce the duty if we were returned to power.

A little earlier in the year, speaking at Bedford in Missisquoi in the province of Quebec,