

I will now give hon. gentlemen time to think out what that means. I have tried for weeks myself, and I do not know yet.

Who can tell what will be the condition we will have to deal with to-morrow? This platform was laid down two years ago. We had not then acquired these railway systems.

No, that is quite correct, and the Poincare government had not fallen. Each has an equal bearing on the point. He goes on:

They ought to be applauding me for saying I am not going to follow any letter that leads to destruction.

Did the voters who answered that appeal vote for the 1919 platform? Or again, an auditor puts the question:

You stated in the House in 1920, that you would stand all fours by the Liberal Convention's trade platform. Now you say it is only a chart.

A very pertinent question because in 1920 we had acquired the railway systems, when the present Prime Minister affirmed his fidelity to the platform of 1919. Here is the answer:

I stated my position—

I read you how he stated it.

If it is not intelligible to you I am sorry. That is not my fault. Do you know the meaning of this passage in scripture, "It is the letter that killeth, but the spirit that maketh alive." It is in accordance with that teaching I propose to carry out the Liberal platform. No legitimate industry need fear anything that the Liberal party might do in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is my hon. friend reading from?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am reading a quotation from the Brantford Expositor, I think. It is quoted in another paper. There is another portion really worth reading too.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If it is as good as the last it will be very good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was very good, the Prime Minister says. It was. It was simply typical of the whole nature of his campaign. Here is another extract from his speech at Sherbrooke:

There is not a man in the Liberal party to-day who would think of doing injury by way of tariff to any industry carrying on a legitimate business and earning legitimate profits. We have no desire to hurt any industry. Why should we do so, especially at this time? Where men are trying to create monopolies against the interests of the country we will let in the light and make a change, but have no thought of making a change where business is being carried on honestly and decently.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What paper is that from?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a quotation from his speech as taken from the report of the

Montreal Gazette. Does the hon. member dispute its accuracy?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, but my hon. friend has not read the whole speech.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope I would not. I do not know whether in this case, but in others, I have no doubt that if I went on I would read exactly the opposite. That is why the Prime Minister finds himself in the position he is in, in this House now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my hon. friend would read to the House one quotation that is the opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I could read what the Prime Minister said in June 1920 in this parliament, when he read the platform of 1919 and declared as a matter of honour he was bound to abide by it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I read it here a year ago. Are we to infer that these industries as respects which changes are made, as respects which the whole protection in some cases is taken away, were not carried on legitimately? Were they earning more than a legitimate profit? I appeal to the Prime Minister to say, especially with respect to those who were not earning anything at all. I appeal now to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock): Are the industries attacked by this budget, whose duties are reduced or taken away, industries which were not carried on decently or honestly, or are they industries which were earning an illegitimate profit? The Prime Minister to-day finds himself confronted by hon. gentlemen to my left, telling him that he went to the country on the 1919 platform, reading to him the terms of that platform, and declaring that he bound himself in parliament and on the stump to abide by it, declaring that he got his support upon it, and at the same time hon. gentlemen opposite rise one after the other and say: The Prime Minister assured me in my own town that no legitimate industry would be affected, assured me that no industry earning only a moderate profit would be touched, and on that assurance I became his candidate, and on that assurance I was elected." Is it any wonder I question what the verdict really was?

Let me read now a statement from a paper which supports hon. gentlemen to my left, the Farmers' Sun. I have here an extract from that paper, an editorial from its issue of March 15.