

Maclean left the Cabinet. And what was the statement made by Mr. Calder during the elections? Speaking in the presence of two of his colleagues whom I have just mentioned, he said:

We were prepared for the time being to sink our differences of opinion in so far as many of the domestic and local problems which we have are concerned. We must do that to get union. Just imagine what would have happened if Mr. Crerar had sat down with Sir Thomas White to try and get together on questions of tariff.

We would never have had Union if one of the requirements was that it had to be reached on the question of the tariff.

That is what Mr. Calder said to the people. So I wonder why my honourable friend (Hon. Sir James Lougheed) can claim a mandate for the Government to touch some of the matters that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and more especially that important question to which he devoted about three-quarters of the time he spent in discussing the questions to come before this Chamber during the present Session.

It seems clear that the people of Canada in 1917 were told that the tariff question would not be taken up by the Union Government. It is clear because the Ministers themselves spoke out openly and declared that they had not formed that Government for the purpose of dealing with any of those delicate questions upon which they were at variance.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: I would like to ask the honourable gentleman a question if he has no objection. How does he account for the fact that those three gentlemen who retired from the Cabinet retired at different times, with a considerable space of time after each retirement, if they were elected only for a certain period, or if they joined the Cabinet only for a certain period and for a certain purpose?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: None of those three gentlemen made a formal statement as to the reason why he was withdrawing at a particular time, except perhaps Mr. Crerar, whose statement I have in mind, and who declared that his mandate was ended. I do not remember any statement being made by Mr. Carvell or by Mr. Maclean. I know they did not leave the Cabinet at the same time, but they did leave the Cabinet and they are in it no longer. But what I emphasized more especially is the fact—

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: So much the better for the Cabinet.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I suppose my honourable friend would very likely applaud the departure of some members of the present Cabinet, and we would all agree if he would press on and ask that the whole Cabinet resign or offer itself for re-election at as early a date as possible.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Then the honourable gentleman might come in, and that would be a misfortune.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: No, I have no inclination in that direction—I have not that ambition. I do not think my honourable friend will see me in any Cabinet—

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: No.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: —even if we have elections next week.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: No, I think not.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My honourable friend (Hon. Sir James Lougheed) said: "We have had a mandate ever since 1911." I will discuss for a moment the kind of mandate which this Government received in 1917, and, with his permission, I will revert to 1911. I think that I shall be able to demonstrate that the elections of 1917 were based on a stupendous fraud, and that the elections of 1911 were based on duplicity, or at all events insincerity.

I said the elections of 1917 had been the result of a tremendous fraud. The War-time Elections Act was before us. I made the following statement, which I take from page 1149 of the Debates of 1917:

We have devised all kinds of penalties to prevent ballot-plugging and ballot-switching. Are we not now, by allowing the non-resident elector to switch his vote to where he pleases, making an attempt to organize the non-resident soldiers into a ballot-plugging and ballot-switching brigade?

That was, as I viewed the Act which was presented to us. I felt, as it was going on the statue book, that the whole basis of our democratic institutions was being flung to the four winds. As a result of this legislation, how did the electoral franchise work? Strangers who had never put their foot in Canada, thousands of soldiers who had been enlisted in the United States, were allowed to switch their votes to whatever county the men in power thought was in danger. Not only were those strangers allowed to switch their votes, but there was practically no limit to the number of soldiers in England and on the continent of Europe who switched their vote to whatever county the man at their elbow sug-