

been manly enough to say, "I will resign before I will remain in this cabinet and be a party to that procedure." If that is not the case, then they were all parties to it as indeed, they are under our theory of the collective responsibility of the cabinet. It is my belief that the policies of my right hon. friend were not revealed to his own government. Certainly they were not revealed to this parliament; certainly they were not disclosed to the country, and in all those things I think he has offended against the best traditions of parliamentary procedure and government.

But the serious part is this, and I come back again to the question of the selling of Canadian wheat in Britain. We do not need to go to the conference in London to find out why the Prime Minister failed; we do not need to discuss what took place in London to see why there has been no enlargement of the market for Canadian wheat in Britain as a consequence of what took place at the conference. The Prime Minister was doomed to failure before he left this country, if he had in mind the particular policies which he subsequently proposed; he was doomed to failure when in this parliament, on the eve of going to England, he forced through those increases in the tariff which changed the whole feeling and view of the British public mind in relation to this country. I repeat that I am at a loss to understand his action or the motive behind it. I have asked myself this question: Can it be that promises were made which he had not expected would have to be redeemed and that, being a man of his word, he felt bound regardless of consequences to see they were carried out? I have asked myself this question: Is it because he believes in coercion and because he thinks he will be strong enough to carry that policy even against the government of Great Britain? I have come back to this thought, and perhaps he will tell me if I am wrong. I believe that what he had in mind was a desire to further his conception of a Canadian economic unit, as he calls it; to make out of this country a self-sufficing economic unit, non-trading, beyond its borders, a country that will work exclusively within itself and confine its trade to itself; that in his heart of hearts he believes that this is going to be in the interests of Canada, though how he can believe it surpasses human comprehension. How this country, made into an isolated economic unit, is to prosper and develop along with the other nations of the world, is something indeed very difficult to understand, but the more I follow

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

his actions here and at the Imperial conference the more I come to believe that this has been the actuating motive, that the proposals he made were made with a view to their being rejected so that it would be a little easier for him to put up the tariff again against Great Britain, if need be, in order to avoid trade from that source and so further to secure monopoly to those special interests already protected behind the highest of tariff walls. If that is not the case, I hope my right hon. friend will so inform the house when he gets up to speak.

I will give to the house one or two references which bear out what I have just said. The change in front with respect to the British preference is remarkable in view of what my hon. friend said during the last session when the Dunning budget was introduced. At that time the preferences were there; they were known to my right hon. friend; we were discussing the Imperial conference, and at that time in this House of Commons, standing where I am standing at this moment, my right hon. friend told this parliament that as an expression of affection and goodwill towards the mother country he approved of these preferences. What transpired between that moment and the time when my right hon. friend went to England to rid him entirely of that feeling of affection and goodwill towards the mother country? Perhaps he will answer that question. Let me read his words, which will be found in Hansard of May 6, 1930, at page 1833. They are as follows:

In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to our position with respect to British preference, I wish to say the following: As an earnest of our affection and goodwill, as an expression of the hope we all have that some day a closer economic alliance of empire states may find being, I commend the measures for British preference which the minister proposes.

That speech was made here; it was made to do duty for the Conservative party throughout the campaign. When my hon. friends were speaking in parts of the country where there were those who were known to be favourable to the British preference the words of the present Prime Minister were read as favouring the preference as an expression of goodwill and affection towards the mother country. I ask my right hon. friend, when he gets up to speak, to tell this house and the country what transpired during the course of that campaign which caused him to alter his whole view in that particular and, at a special session of parliament, to wipe out these very preferences which he said should stand as an earnest of affection and goodwill in connection with our relations with the mother country.