

not be considered. On the basis of that assurance he made his appeal to the electors of western Canada, and of other parts of the Dominion as well. In the face of that I ask my right hon. friend how can he presume to deny to the people of Canada the right to return a representative parliament to deal with that issue when the time comes for it to be taken up.

The hon. member for Marquette was not the only minister who spoke in that way at that time. A member of the present administration—the Minister of Immigration and Colonization —(Mr. Calder)—also gave his word to the electors of Canada as to what would be done by the administration. I now ask my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) how he reconciles his remaining as a member of the Government which contemplates a revision of the tariff with the statements which I am about to read to him—statements made at a time when the Minister of Immigration and Colonization gave his word of honour as a public man to the people of Canada as to the grounds on which the administration should be returned in 1917. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization said:

It is because we are in the war, and all that it means, that we three men happen to sit just where we are to-day. The one main issue is whether we are to carry on or not. We have simply consented to union for the immediate purpose of this war and the solution of the problems arising out of the war and we are prepared—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KING: I hear hon. gentlemen opposite applauding the statement as to dealing with the issues that grew out of the war. Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that the tariff is an issue that grew out of the war? If so they can place any issue under heaven in a similar category. If my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) now holds such a view, he surely entertains an entirely different mental attitude from what he did at the time to which I refer, when he declared that the tariff was to be excluded from consideration by the Government. In 1917 my hon. friend was very careful to say that the tariff would not be a matter to be considered.

My hon. friend (Mr. Calder) went on to say:

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.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Let me repeat: the hon. minister said:

Just imagine what would happen if Mr. Crerar had sat down with Sir Thomas White and tried to get together on the question of the tariff.

I ask my hon. friends opposite who applauded the idea of the tariff being an issue growing out of the war whether they will applaud that remark? Unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to do so they have no right to presume that the tariff is a question with which they can deal to the exclusion of a parliament so empowered by the people. My hon. friend went on to say:

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

I ask my hon. friend, as a member of the present Government and as a member of the Government speaking at that time, whether he meant what he said on that occasion.

An hon. MEMBER: He was only joking.

Mr. KING: Was my hon. friend telling the people the truth at that time or had he something else in his mind? Was he quite sincere in what he said then? I find difficulty in reconciling his utterances with his remaining at the present time in a ministry which is attempting to deal with the tariff. Let me read the sentence again:

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

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who said that?

Mr. KING: The Minister of Immigration and Colonization, the present President of the Privy Council. He went on to say:

We found it absolutely necessary on both sides, on the Conservative Party's part and our own, to sink all differences of opinion in connection with these domestic problems. So far as I am concerned, on the questions of tariff, banking, agricultural credit, land settlement, and all those problems affecting our western people, I stand where I stood three weeks ago, and I am certain my friend (Mr. Crerar) does not stand far from that position. But for the time being, we let them go by the board, and we go into this union with an entirely different purpose.

Again, may I ask, in the face of such an appeal to the electorate, the bonafides of which were vouched for by his presence on the platform, and with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization still one of the ministers in his own administration, how dare my right hon. friend presume to say that his Government is justified in dealing with this all-important question, without first giving to the people of Canada