

RT. HON. MACKENZIE KING OPENS LIBERAL CAMPAIGN

(Continued from Page 1.)
have returned to them in the form of a government cheque a portion of the taxes they had paid into the public treasury?

Then there was the tax on receipts, not reduced, but abolished altogether.

There were also reductions in the sales tax and excise taxes.

Finally, there is the reduction in the postal rates—the return to penny postage.

Add to all this that accompanying these reductions in taxation has come a reduction in the national public debt and a balancing of the national budget over a series of years, together with an expansion of trade and a favorable balance of exports over imports unparalleled in the peace-time history of the Dominion and you have a record of the administration of the country's finances and business which has not been equaled by any government in Canada.

This is a part of the record on which we make our appeal for their support to the electors of Canada. We need not promise reductions in taxation—we have already given reductions; we need not promise prosperity—everyone knows that prosperity has returned and that, with a continuation of Liberal policies, prosperity has come to stay.

No More Blue Ruin Talk.

You were told by our Conservative opponents at the last general elections that Canada was being ruled under Liberal administration, that our industries were going to the wall and our people in increasing numbers were going to the United States, that only an all-round increase in the protective tariff could save the situation. You heard an echo of this dolorous wall in the Prime Minister's speech on Tuesday night. Every representation of the kind has been proven to be false. The country has not been prosperous in years, nor the country's business and finances in the splendid shape they are in to-day. Look where you will, be it the returns of our railways, the deposits in our banks, the increase in the numbers and amounts of insurance policies and building permits, the increase in employment, the increase in immigration, the rapidly growing statistics of industry and trade—on every side are evidences of the increased prosperity which has come to Canada during our years of office.

Treaty With West Indies.

Another important measure which was saved from destruction through having received the Royal Assent on June 15th at the same time as the reciprocal trade agreement between Canada and the British West Indies, Bermuda, British Guiana and British Honduras. This Treaty, as signed, but not yet approved by Parliament, was, it will be recalled, before the country at the last General Elections. Like the Commercial Treaty with Australia—another sister British Community—which treaty had been passed at the session of 1925, it was denounced by Mr. Meighen and his followers as prejudicial to Canada's interests and trade. Once, however, the election was over, the West Indies Trade Treaty passed the House of Commons, and the Senate, without so much as a division. Indeed, it passed with general commendation of its members of all parties. So much for Tory denunciation on the political platform!

Royal Assent Denied.

The Prime Minister would have the country believe that for the most part the legislation of the session "which failed to be signed by the Governor-General is in all important features being put into effect"—of measures which had passed both Houses, or were in the last stages of amendment and to which, with dissolution in view, arrangements for the Royal Assent might easily have been made had Parliament been properly prorogued as it should have been, the most important was a Bill for the purpose of establishing in Canada a system of long-term mortgage credit for farmers, known popularly as the "Rural Credits" Bill; a Bill amending the Grain Act in an important particular, the Bill to provide for the Revaluation of Soldiers' Settlement lands, a Bill to provide a loan to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and a Bill to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act. To these bills should be added the appropriation of monies necessary to carry on the public business and public works of the country, including the Hudson's Bay Railway and other projects, many of which had been fully discussed in the Commons, and to all of which both the Conservative and Liberal Parties in Parliament may be assumed to have at least tentatively agreed, through the acceptance by Mr. Meighen's Administration of the estimates as presented to Parliament or as prepared by the preceding administration.

Tariff Advisory Board.

At this point, I should perhaps make mention of the appointment during the Session of the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation and of the Royal Commission to inquire into the problems of the Maritime Provinces—sometimes referred to as the Maritime Rights Commission. Each of these important bodies was established in fulfillment of undertakings during the last general elections, and of the programme of proposed measures and enactments outlined in the Speech from the Throne. Whilst, from members of the official Opposition, mild criticism

ism was directed against features of the Tariff Board and the Maritime Rights Commission, no formal objection was taken in any motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, or by any of his following, either to the personnel, or to the duties and responsibilities of these two bodies. If public opinion as voiced by the Press of the country is a gauge at all, it may be said that the Government's action as respects both the Tariff Advisory Board and the Maritime Commission met with hearty endorsement and commendation.

SO-CALLED "CENSURE" OF THE ADMINISTRATION

I come now to the concluding days of the session, and to the dissolution of Parliament—first, the request for dissolution made by myself as Prime Minister, and which was not granted by His Excellency the Governor-General, and next the request for dissolution made three days later by Mr. Meighen as Prime Minister and which was granted.

Mr. Meighen and the members of his party would have the public believe that the reason I sought dissolution at the time I did was in order to avoid "a vote of censure" being passed upon the administration because of certain facts disclosed before a special committee of the House of Commons with respect to the administration of the Department of Customs, which committee was appointed in the opening days of the session and brought in its report as the session was drawing its proceedings to a close. To this assertion or allegation I give the most emphatic denial.

Stevens' Amendment.

First of all, may I be permitted to point out that the word "censure," or its equivalent in parliamentary terminology, neither appears in the Stevens' amendment nor in the report of the Special Committee which it sought to amend, nor in any Stevens' amendment uses the words "wholly indefensible" in reference to the alleged failure of myself and the government "to take prompt and effective remedial action" with respect to certain matters in the department of Customs, and the words "utterly unjustifiable" in reference to one particular act of Mr. Bolvin. These words have become enlarged upon and their meaning exaggerated in party controversy and public discussion into a "censure of the government," "a censure of the entire administration," involving its resignation. Mr. Meighen, speaking in this Auditorium on Tuesday of this week, soundly the keynote of his campaign, deliberately misquoted these words and misrepresented their meaning and significance; he said that "the House of Commons had declared" that the Prime Minister's refusal to remedy the evil was "absolutely incapable of defence." Those words will not be found anywhere, except as coming from Mr. Meighen's lips. That "the House of Commons"—I again quote his words—"censured not only the past Minister of Customs, but the then Minister of Customs and the entire government for malfeasance of office." With respect to these words as well, I repeat, they are to be found only in Mr. Meighen's own vocabulary. A vote of censure of an administration for malfeasance of office makes use of these terms in an unmistakable way; and no one knows that better than the present Prime Minister.

Would Not Be Carried.

Apart from this, however, at the time I advised His Excellency that a dissolution of parliament in my opinion necessary and inevitable, I had the best reasons for believing that if I were to continue to lead the House, the portion of the Stevens' amendment which contained the words I have quoted would not be carried.

Before Parliament adjourned on the night of Friday, June 25th, or at any time in the early morning of June 26th, I personally showed to several members of the Progressive Party, proposed amendment to Mr. Stevens' motion. My object was to ascertain in advance of having the amendment presented whether or not, if moved, it would be acceptable to them. That proposed amendment eliminated from the Stevens' amendment the clause which contained the words "wholly indefensible" and "utterly unjustifiable" and substituted in their stead a proposal to appoint a Royal Commission of three judges, one to be appointed by the Prime Minister, one by the Leader of the Opposition, and one by the Leader of the Progressive Party, which Commission was to continue the investigation into the administration of the Customs Department and alleged smuggling operations, and to bring before me for examination all Ministers of Customs and all persons directly or indirectly reflected upon in the report of the Special Committee, the Commission to report its findings and recommendations to Parliament at the next session. I received the most explicit assurances that such an amendment would be acceptable and would be supported, and it was after having received this assurance that I subsequently went into the House of Commons and agreed on behalf of the Government to accept the amendment to the Stevens' amendment then before the House which acceptance was followed by an adjournment of the House.

Of those who on Friday night indicated their willingness and intention to support the amendment eliminating the words referred to, a

sufficient number on the Tuesday following voted against this very amendment when moved by Mr. Rinfret, thereby causing its defeat, and enabling the Stevens amendment to be carried.

Why Stevens' Amendment Carried?

The reason of the change in attitude of certain members of the Progressive group is not far to seek; it is easily explained. Members of the Progressive Party and for that matter, members of other parties as well, did not expect nor did they wish a dissolution of parliament. They certainly did not wish a dissolution before the legislation which was in its final stages and in which they were specially interested had been assented to. Had I not resigned as Prime Minister, sufficient of their number were prepared to assist me to carry on and through the session. When I resigned and Mr. Meighen accepted the office of Prime Minister, sufficient of their number were equally prepared, so far as the measures referred to were concerned, to give him their support. It was a matter of getting through with the session and securing the enactment of the balance of the legislation and of avoiding, if possible, another early general election. It will be recalled that such was the tenor of a resolution which was carried at a caucus of the Progressives held on the morning of Tuesday, June 29th, and which was placed in Mr. Forke's hands for his guidance in the interview which His Excellency the Governor-General had with Mr. Forke at noon that day.

Progressive Support Explained.

Precisely the same kind of situation and attitude presented itself on June 30th with respect to the resolution moved by myself as Leader of the Opposition in amendment to the motion to go into Supply and which was moved immediately after the Stevens amendment and the report of the Customs Committee had been disposed of. That amendment was as follows:

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the fiscal policy of the government as enunciated by the present Prime Minister when leader of His Majesty's opposition would prove detrimental to the country's continued prosperity and prejudicial to national unity."

That amendment, which was of the very essence of the difference between Mr. Meighen and all those views on fiscal policy differed from his own, was opposed by each of the Progressive Members from the Province of Alberta to cause it to be defeated by a majority of 7. In the debate on the budget, every one of these gentlemen supported Mr. Robb's budget resolutions and voted down the milk-and-water amendment moved from Mr. Meighen's side of the House and which resulted in the Liberal government being sustained on its fiscal policies by a majority of 13 in a division which was the largest, the most important and the most significant of the session. Does anyone suppose that conviction of principle on fiscal policy explains the vote cast on this amendment, or that the vote constituted an expression of confidence in Mr. Meighen's "temporary government," as its members would have us believe? Certainly not. Some of those who voted against the amendment, contrary to their own beliefs and convictions on fiscal matters did not hesitate to declare that they did so because they believed that to have supported the amendment would have meant the defeat of Mr. Meighen's temporary administration which, in the circumstances, they conceived it their duty to support as a means of getting through what remained of the legislation of the session.

In making mention of these facts I am not seeking to pass judgment in any way, least of all to criticize adversely. I wish to make no comment whatever. I am seeking only to explain what may appear a very strange proceeding, and to show that the votes as recorded in the concluding days of the session were, in the case of some at least, not expressive of any conviction upon the motions to which they were related, but were influenced by considerations wholly apart from the subject matter of the resolution. What, in this regard is true of the amendment with respect to fiscal policy is equally true of the Stevens' and other amendments moved after Mr. Meighen's "temporary" government came into office.

Dissolution Requested.

Why, then, it may be asked, if I were sure of support to the close of the session, did I not seek to carry on. The answer is that throughout the week of June 20-25, I had witnessed what appeared to me to be no end of intrigue with respect both to the Stevens' amendment and the amendment to the Grain Bill which was that week before the Senate. It was apparent that the Tories in both Houses were working together to embarrass the administration, that the Tory majority in the Senate was so manipulating procedure with respect to the Grain Bill as to influence the action of certain members in the House of Commons. It was equally apparent that certain members of the Progressive Party who, at the outset of the session, had agreed to an honorable co-operation with the government on its legislative programme, but who, throughout the session, because of their previous Tory predilections and affiliations, had given but a grudging support even to their own group, had decided to end that co-operation and to do so in a manner which would occasion most embarrassment to the administration. In the circumstances, I felt that matters had come to a pass where there was far too much of intrigue and uncertainty to permit of government being carried



KINGSTON PEOPLE!

COME

For a Wonderful BOAT TRIP HOLIDAY

The Luxurious Steamer "RAPIDS KING"

Makes delightful Cruises to Alexandria Bay via Rochester, Canal Bridge, Belleville, Kingston and return to Rochester via the same ports.

Every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday until September 4th, the palatial steamer "Rapids King" leaves Rochester for this wonderful cruise through the Bay of Quinte and the Thousand Islands to Alexandria Bay.

Steamer leaves Rochester at 9 a.m. (Daylight Saving Time), and heads for the Canadian shore, passing through the Murray Canal and entering the beautiful Bay of Quinte.

Stop is made at 1:30 p.m. at Canal Bridge. Fourteen miles further on Belleville is reached at 2:50 p.m. An evening approach the steamer arrives at Kingston—the end of the Bay of Quinte—arriving at Kingston 7:50 p.m.

Then on to the St. Lawrence River entrance and through the beautiful and picturesque Thousand Islands, passing Round Island and Thousand Island Park, arriving at Alexandria Bay, N. Y., at 10:35 p.m.

Steamer leaves Alexandria Bay the next morning at 7 a.m., making the return trip entirely by daylight. Steamer arrives back in Kingston at 7:45 a.m.

Return trip is made to Rochester on Wednesdays, Fridays and Sundays. On Sundays "layover" of one hour and fifteen minutes is made at Kingston for Church Services.

For full information regarding rates, etc., apply J. P. HANLEY, O.S.L. AGENT, KINGSTON, ONT.

CANADA STEAMSHIP LINES LIMITED

Very Low Rates For this Wonderful Cruise

ried on in a manner befitting the honor and dignity of Parliament, and that only a declaration that an appeal to the people would follow the conclusion of the session, would enable its proceedings to be brought satisfactorily to a close. I felt that with the support which had been accorded my administration throughout the session, matters had reached a stage where I was unable to carry on with the regard which was due to the responsibilities of a Prime Minister for the proceedings of parliament no one else could be found who to that end could form an administration, and that dissolution at an early date was not only in the public interest but inevitable, and I so advised His Excellency.

Relations With Governor-General.

Mr. Meighen and the Conservative press are seeking, and would like to make it appear that the constitutional question which has thus arisen is in reality an issue between His Excellency the Governor-General and myself. Nothing could be further from the truth. My personal relations with Lord Byng from the moment His Excellency invited me to form a Ministry to the moment he accepted my resignation as Prime Minister were of an exceptionally friendly character. My official relations with His Excellency were all that I could have desired them to be in the difference of our conceptions of the relations of Prime Minister and Governor-General as I came up in regard to the advice I tendered with respect to dissolution, and which opened up between us a very wide field of difference. We differed honestly in opinion; there was no other difference.

In his speech in this Auditorium on Tuesday evening the present Prime Minister ventured to express what he termed were the reasons why my advice was not accepted by His Excellency. He sought to have it appear that this was because of a vote of censure under debate at the time. He even went so far as to put into my mouth words which I was supposed to have addressed to the Governor-General, and as if this were not enough, he had these words inserted in quotation marks in the copy of his speech given to the press and they so appear in the papers all over this country.

In these circumstances, whether I might wish to do so or not, I am obliged to make perfectly clear what were the grounds on which His Excellency and I differed.

Dissolution Refused.

I think I do full justice to His Excellency when I say that he conceived it to be his duty in the circumstances of the late Parliament to act as a sort of umpire between the political parties in Canada. Indeed, I think I use His Excellency's own words when I say that he held the view that I had had a chance to govern and that Mr. Meighen had not been given a chance of trying to govern or saying that he could do so, and that all reasonable expedients

should be tried before resorting to another election. Holding this view and believing the prerogative of dissolution was his to exercise, His Excellency was unwilling at the time to grant a dissolution. I took the position which I have mentioned here tonight, that Mr. Meighen's chance to govern had all along been quite as good as my own, that throughout the session the House of Commons had consistently declined to give him his confidence, and I did not see how it could now be expected to give its confidence to any ministry he might attempt to form. That as to which political party had the right to govern, that was a matter which, as I had pointed out after the last general election, it was for parliament to decide, if parliament were in a position so to do; that when parliament ceased to be in a position to make a satisfactory decision as to which party should govern it was then for the people to decide. In neither case, I maintained, was it a duty or a responsibility of the Governor-General to make the decision. I stated that in my humble opinion it was not for the Crown or its representative to be concerned with the differences of political parties, and that the prerogative of dissolution, like other prerogatives of the Crown, had come under British practice to be exercised by the Sovereign on the advice of his Prime Minister. It was for the Crown's advisor to say whether or not dissolution was necessary and for the Crown's advisor to take the responsibility of the advice tendered. Once a dissolution was granted, the people would soon say whether in the circumstances the advice tendered was or was not in accord with their wishes. In a word, the position I took was that in Canada, the relation of Prime Minister to Governor-General is the same in all essential respects as that of Prime Minister to the King in Great Britain.

The Issue.

That, may I say, is the position for which I now stand, and for which the Liberal Party in Canada stands. It need not involve His Excellency in any particular. I am prepared to accept all that is implied in that maxim, "The King can do no wrong" and to say that it applies to His Majesty's representative in Canada. Had the present Prime Minister not fully accepted responsibility for the action of the Governor-General in refusing to accept my advice, and for the position His Excellency has taken, there might then be an issue in which the Governor-General would be directly involved. That, happily, is not the case as matters stand; the issue, as respects the constitutionality of the Governor-General's course of procedure is not between His Excellency and myself, but between the political parties represented by Mr. Meighen and myself, since, in the name of the parties we respectively

lead, we have accepted full responsibility for views which are diametrically opposed as to what in situation such as has arisen is the right constitutional position. In this matter, it is through their support of the respective political parties that the people of Canada have now the opportunity to make their opinions and wishes known.

SOME SYMPTOMS OF THIN BLOOD

Everybody Should be Able to Recognize Them Because Early Treatment is Important.

Anaemia, or lack of blood, is a stealthy disease and is often quite advanced before it is recognized. It is much easier to correct in its early stages, but if unchecked causes weakness, loss of weight, lack of vigor and ambition.

Some symptoms of anaemia are loss of appetite, indigestion, headache, sleeplessness, shortness of breath after slight exertion, and often extreme nervousness. If you have any or all of these symptoms begin treatment now with Dr. Williams' Pink Pills, the tonic which will make the blood rich and plentiful. Every part of the body will respond to this treatment as is shown by the case of Mrs. Isaac Bell, Sr., Fort Anson, Ont., who says:—"A few years ago I was a very sickly woman. I was all run down and my nerves badly shattered. I had taken doctor's medicine, but as I got no help from it, I tried other medicines, but with no better results. One day while reading a newspaper, I came across an advertisement of Dr. Williams' Pink Pills describing a case very much like my own. I decided to try them, and by the time I had taken two boxes I could feel the benefit I was getting from them, so I cheerfully continued the treatment and was soon a well woman in better health than I had enjoyed for some years. In view of what Dr. Williams' Pink Pills have done for me I cheerfully recommend their use to all weak, run-down people."

Working Feldspar Mine. Lake Opinicon, July 22.—The weather is real warm here these days and everything is growing fine. A number of men are engaged working in the spar mine at Rock Lake. We hope for good results. Mrs. W. McFeduge and baby, also E. Hunter, Kingston, spent a week's vacation here. Edward Hunter and Miss Lillian Black spent Sunday at K. Darling's. C. Stokes at C. Ennis', F. Best and family, Chaffey's Lock, at K. Darling's.