

the carrying on of the war, and he is right. That was the great issue of the 1917 contest, not only great but overwhelmingly great: that was the issue that overshadowed all others, and in the main was the reason for the vast popular majority which this Government succeeded in obtaining. But does that mean that this Government has no duty save to carry on the war? But if it had no duty save what my hon. friend himself is willing to accord it, namely the duty of dealing with the problems of war and the problems that succeed and grow out of the war, this Government's duty is not yet done. Is there an hon. member who will argue that we in Canada are even substantially past the problems of the war? There is not a problem that confronts us now, not a difficulty that we have to surmount, not a mountain that we have to scale, that is not placed where it is and is not of the magnitude that it is by reason of the war, and is not directly, in point of character and origin, related to the problems of the war and growing out of the war itself. Is re-establishment complete? I agree, very much has been done; I believe more has been achieved in this country than in any other. But to say that all the problems of re-establishment are solved is to utter language that undoubtedly argues a lack of acquaintance with conditions in Canada at this hour. But, though the war and the problems of the war were the first duty of the Government, though the carrying on of the war was the great overwhelming issue in the contest that elected this Government, the duties of this Government were just as wide and sweeping in their scope, just as inclusive of everything that pertains to Government in Canada as were the duties of any Government ever entrusted with power. In the platform on which we appealed to the electors in 1917, though it was set out in the plainest terms that the carrying on of the war was the great purpose of that campaign, there are no less than thirteen or more other distinct duties which the Government set itself to perform; some of them related to the war, many of them only remotely related to the war, many of them not so much connected with the war as are the problems that now confront us. This Government set itself the task of carrying those duties out.

Was this Government absolved from the duty, yea, the necessity, of dealing with every question that ordinarily comes within the scope of the functions of a Government? If we were so circum-

scribed, if we were so restrained, who was to carry on this work who was to be responsible? Was nobody to attend to it? Did we not have to attend to it? "Ah," my hon. friend says; "you have no business to touch the tariff at all; you should not touch anything except something connected with the war." Does he know that during the very first year after the Government was elected and while the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was a member of the Government and all the elected members of the Government were there, the tariff was affected, the tariff was, indeed, reduced? And the following year the same? In every year of our existence the necessities of the tariff situation were attended to. No general revision was brought on, but that was because the time had not come when a general revision could be made with advantage to this country, when the necessary information could be obtained and when we would be in a position to lay before Parliament the terms of a revision that would be sufficiently studied and thought out. But in relation not only to the tariff, but to every other subject, the Government had dealt with these problems in the same way as it would deal with the war or any problem arising out of the war. It is true that in the concert of principles upon which the members of the Government came to common ground in the fall of 1917 we did not then agree on any matters of permanent tariff policy for Canada, and the words of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) quoted by my hon. friend this afternoon were true and apt words: they spoke no more than what was the fact. But because it was not necessary to agree upon that issue for the purpose of union at that time, did that preclude us from agreement at any time on what should be the lines of tariff policy in this country during the constitutional term of office of this Government? The Minister of Immigration and Colonization did not say so. My hon. friend himself never thought so until very lately. Why, when, did it occur to him that this Parliament had no right to deal with the tariff? That is a new thought that was born in his mind in the course of the Peterborough election. Will the House believe that it is not yet twelve months since the Leader of the Opposition seconded a motion in this House demanding that the Government deal with the tariff at once? But let me come back to the argument that I did not fully complete, namely, that the composition of the Government is different in that those who