

**T. HON. ARTHUR MEIGHEN
SCORES LIBS. AND PROGRESSIVES**

(Continued from Page 4)

It is to hon. members to my left, who do not seem to see that the practice of making a pledge and violating it that we are talking about. He has searched the recesses of his mind in vain to get me an excuse for refusing to vote in favour of the Government of the day, though that Government has followed demoralizing practice—a practice that he says reprehends.

Now, let me turn for a moment to the position of hon. gentlemen to my left. They are not on very strong ground to chide the Government. Indeed, the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) has a large share of the responsibility in relation to this budget. The leader of the Progressive party in this session gave the Government notice that if they turned their backs on their fiscal pledges he would refuse to call them to account. He indeed held out an invitation to the Government to abandon the pledges they had solemnly made to the people of this country. The first sign of conduct on the part of the Government was when they turned away from their pledge to make additional cash grants to returned soldiers—turned that without a word, without a sign of hesitation, and declared they did not intend to fulfil it or any part of it. The leader of the Progressive party then asked all his followers to vote against a censure of the Government for the guilt of such conduct. Well, were they any more bound by the one pledge than by the other? Once you put the seal of your blessing upon that kind of conduct you take the whole consequences and those consequences are upon the leader of the Progressive party and his followers are taking now. "Oh," he said, "I cannot vote for this amendment because it says that the budget proposals constitute an utter failure to implement the pledges of the party by legislation." Such language is too strong, he says.

Mr. Crerar: I want to correct my hon. friend. He is indulging in a good many excursions this afternoon, and I want as far as possible to keep him to the line of truth.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Crerar: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am out of order it is certainly unintentional on my part. I will say, to keep him to the correct line. He can read my remarks of yesterday and he will find no reflection on himself in our position; he has just attributed to me.

Mr. Meighen: I have Hansard before me, and I will read exactly what my hon. friend said:

The terms of the amendment are very simple; they state that the budget proposals brought down constitute on the part of the Government an utter failure to implement its pledges by legislation. Well, while I have been pretty severe in my criticism of the Government, I do not think those words are justified by the actual facts of the case.

Mr. Crerar: Hear, hear.

Mr. Meighen: That is precisely what I said.

Mr. Crerar: No, it was not.

Mr. Meighen: Hansard will support my vindication. He could not support the amendment because it declared that the budget proposals constituted an utter failure to implement those pledges by legislation. Well, do they not constitute an utter failure? The hon. member said he could not go that far, but his own amendment goes that far; it declares that the budget proposals are wholly inadequate to implement the pledges by legislation. The leader of the Progressive party refuses to vote for our amendment because it says that the proposals are an utter failure to redeem pledges, but he is ready to vote for his own, which says they are wholly inadequate to implement the pledges by legislation. The leader of the Progressive party refuses to vote for our amendment because it says that the proposals are an utter failure to redeem pledges, but he is ready to vote for his own, which says they are wholly inadequate to implement the pledges by legislation. The leader of the Progressive party refuses to vote for our amendment because it says that the proposals are an utter failure to redeem pledges, but he is ready to vote for his own, which says they are wholly inadequate to implement the pledges by legislation. The leader of the Progressive party refuses to vote for our amendment because it says that the proposals are an utter failure to redeem pledges, but he is ready to vote for his own, which says they are wholly inadequate to implement the pledges by legislation.

lay at the feet of their constituents the legislative trophies they have won, what they will say in respect to this amendment. These hon. members come down to Parliament with hopes high and language loud and strong. They came for a wheat board—they came to a Liberal Government for a Crownest pass agreement—for a reduced cost of living—for their tariff platform. And they will go back and have to say: No wheat board, nothing of that; no Crownest pass agreement; nothing of that—if I read the countenances of hon. gentlemen the opposite airtight. Cost of living? Worse than nothing there increased and heavily increased, on all the people of this country. The tariff? Nothing there. The Hudson Bay railway, did I hear someone say? I do not know that the railway was so prominent, but if so, nothing there. All nothing. What they can say to their constituents is this: We have nothing to bring back for you, but we remembered our old party—the home of 5 out of 6 of us and we kept the Government in power. We refused to censure them for anything. They were guilty of conduct that one and all of us decided was wrong, guilty of dishonoring their pledged word to the people—but we let the performance go—we really could not join in with the Tories to condemn them. No, they have been the parties, to the extent of their power, to relieve the Government of the obligation of carrying out the program in which they themselves professed to believe. That is the story they must carry back to their constituents.

For my part, were the Government to introduce the legislation to which it pledged itself a year ago, I, not believing in that legislation, would vote against it. But, in addition to not believing in those concrete acts of policy, I do not believe in duplicity, I do not believe in deceiving the electors of Canada.

Mr. Lapointe: What a change.

Mr. Meighen: It is a change from the hon. member. If we are to follow the practice in this Dominion of making concrete pledges to the country, of going to the people and saying, this is what we will do if returned to power, and then coming into office and callously and deliberately violating those pledges, who is responsible government? Hon. members who vote against this amendment vote to declare that when electors hereafter vote on any proposal of public policy, they are not to know or have any idea at all of what is to result from their vote. Such a consequence ends responsible government. Now I come to the sub-amendment so called—

Mr. Crerar: Before dealing with that, would my right hon. friend inform the House whether he will vote for the budget?

Mr. Meighen: I shall not vote for the budget, and I shall give my reasons in a very few minutes. The hon. member for Marquette said, though—and this is really il-

GOLDEN VITAMINES
Nature has provided in the cells of the liver of the cod-fish, a treasure house of golden vitamine-bearing oil, surpassing in vitamine-richness any other form of fat or oil.

SCOTT'S EMULSION
OF PUREST VITAMINE-BEARING COD-LIVER OIL
is the ideal body-building food and tonic for all ages. A little added to the diet stimulates assimilation and re-inforces the body with strength.

Scott's Emulsion a highly charged vitamine-bearing food, builds health. There is no better time than right now to start taking Scott's Emulsion!

Scott & Bowne, Toronto, Ont.

luminating as to his attitude: You have reduced ploughs only 2 1/2 per cent, binders 2 1/2 per cent, but if you had even said that you could not afford to reduce any more because of the needs of the revenue, then I would have accepted it.

Mr. Crerar: I do not think my right hon. friend will find that remark in my statement yesterday. What I did say was that it would then have received consideration from the House.

Mr. Meighen: To save time looking it up, let us assume it was put that way, let us not see much difference, the hon. member really does not have an attitude of favor if those words had been said. Why, the Minister of Finance might just as well have spoken those words as not. He could have said in perfect truth that the needs of the revenue were such that he could not reduce just 2 1/2 per cent, and I venture to say, 20 per cent. The needs of revenue today are four times what they were when his Minister of Customs in his own hearing declared that 17 1/2 per cent was not enough on these same goods. There was nothing in the world to hinder the Minister of Finance giving the hon. member for Marquette that assurance, and I do not hesitate to prophesy that the Minister of Finance will give it yet, and I shall find no fault with him if he does. If he had only done so first, then the gentle breath of this sub-amendment might never have disturbed the Government.

Hon. gentlemen point to where we have voted with the Government on the day of the day. Our principles do not vary because the Government of the day comes over and adopts them. If hon. gentlemen can show that we vary from the principles followed when in office well and good—let them try. But hon. gentlemen to my left take good care that on any matter of consequence, on any vital matter before the people of this country, they do not become parties to any resolution that seriously reflects on hon. gentlemen across the floor.

Mr. Crerar: That was not true on the freight rates resolution.

Mr. Meighen: The hon. gentleman did what he could to acquiesce in the Government's proposal, but that question of from day to day, knowing that the putting of it off means additional freight rates daily to the people of this country, freight rates from which they should have been relieved before this.

Mr. Crerar: Where does my hon. friend find any warrant for that statement?

Mr. Meighen: He refused to support our motion which demanded that the Government announce its policy. Once the Government's policy is announced, that is all the Railway Commission needs, and the Railway Commission is delaying now because of the failure to adopt that resolution which demanded an announcement of Government policy.

Now I state that while the budget follows the protective principle, while no one could honestly dispute that it does—follows it as the old budget followed it—it is not in my judgment, without faults, and some serious faults. There are phases of the proposals of the Minister of Finance that I think carry with them menace to our business, our production and our trade. Indeed, I venture to suggest that we will find in committee the Finance Minister coming pretty much to the views that I shall now express and making some very considerable changes in these same decisions that are so loudly approved by hon. gentlemen to my left. I hope so.

I believe the absence of all special restrictions due to the depreciation of German and Austrian exchange is a mistake on the part of the Minister of Finance, and a mistake that he ought to correct. Germany today is one of the highest protected countries in the world, as is the United States, and Germany today is making marvellous progress, German minds, inventive as ever, have devised a plan by which they are able to maintain the mark value in their own country at a standard several times higher than it reaches for purposes of exchange; that is to say, citizens of Germany are able to get more in goods proportionately for their money than that money is worth in the exchange markets of the world, more by many times over. They do it first of all by multiplying mark production, a tremendous inflation of currency. They do it as well by the stabilization of certain of their essential articles of consumption. By these methods they have managed to put the working men of Germany in circumstances far more advantageous than those in other countries. That truth is recognized the world over. His condition has to be met; it has to be met by special provisions here. There may be another way of dealing with it better than the method heretofore adopted, but I do suggest to the Minister of Finance that something should be done, because if it is not done, the penalty is going to fall on large masses of the workmen of this country and to the practical advantage of none, in relation to coal and in relation

to steel. Having paid special attention to me for daring to say that it had been instrumental in reducing the higher duties, by five per cent on farm implements—having done that he makes this statement to the people of his constituency at Stellarton on October 28, last:

And so, my friends, I am not like Col. Cantley—unwilling to give pledges. I tell you, if I go to Ottawa, I shall urge parliament to put a duty on coal that is a real duty, and not a fake duty.

And speaking of steel he said: I pledge myself along the lines and in the way I have indicated, and I am prepared to say to you that when the Liberal party comes into power after December 6th they will find a solution for these difficulties. We will create conditions under which we can once more bring sunshine and happiness and prosperity to the homes where there is nothing but despair.

How was he going to do it? Further he said:

I am here to pledge that when I go to Ottawa I shall move a resolution in the interests of Nova Scotia that the duties on the steel products produced here would be increased in order to enable them to be effective.

So there will be reason on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite for opposing the Government. If they intend to be faithful to the special platform that they contrived to manufacture for their own special benefit, they must be faithful to their constituents.

Similar comment applies to many hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think that in the history of Canada a government ever sat in office whose position was more impossible than the position of the hon. gentlemen now. Some talk about the difficulties of the Government and sympathize with the Finance Minister. Why, their position is impossible because of their own conduct, because of the situation they have got themselves into by the pledges which they deliberately made and which they cannot fulfil; which they knew, or ought to have known they never could fulfil. The scourge they bear was made by themselves; their difficulties are of their own creation. The fields of revenue had been explored. There is no new field found in this budget—none at all. There is simply the traversing of the old ones. That does not present the difficulty that the Government is in at all. The difficulty the Government is in is this: It is impossible to act in consonance with its own official commitments, wholly impossible, and do justice or save disaster to Canada. It is impossible.

CASTORIA
For Infants and Children.

Mothers Know That Genuine Castoria

Always Bears the Signature of *Dr. J. C. Watson*

In Use For Over Thirty Years

CASTORIA

THE CENTAUR COMPANY, NEW YORK CITY.

Exact Copy of Wrapper.

900 DROPS
CASTORIA
The Proprietary or Patent Medicine for a Vegetable Preparation for Infants Simulating the Food by Regulating the Stomachs and Bowels of INFANTS & CHILDREN
Thereby Promoting Digestion, Cheerfulness and Rest. Contains neither Opium, Morphine nor Mineral. NOT NARCOTIC.
Drops of Old Time SALT PILLS
Painful Stomach
Biliousness
Colic
Diarrhoea
Loose Stools
Flatulency
Wind
Vomiting
Feverishness
Teething
Croup
Whooping Cough
Hysterical Fits
A helpful Remedy for Constipation and Diarrhoea, and Feverishness and LOSS OF SLEEP resulting therefrom in Infancy.
See Similar Signature of *Dr. J. C. Watson*
THE CENTAUR COMPANY, MONTREAL, P.Q.
At 6 months old 35 DROPS 40 CENTS

pledged themselves to policies in which they had no belief and who after receiving a large electorate by so doing and thus gaining the sweets of power violate those pledges cynically and with indifference.

CHANGE FOR BECKETT

LONDON, June 14.—George Carpentier, according to Sporting Life today, has verbally agreed to a return with Joe Beckett, the English heavy-weight, whom Carpentier knocked out in a fight in London two years ago, and will sign a contract soon. If the arrangements go through, the newspaper says, the fight will be staged in London in October.

CORD
33x4
\$40.50

FABRIC
34x4 1/2
\$43.90

WHY PAY THE HIGHER PRICE?

and get less mileage. The Partridge Cord Illustrated above costs \$40.50 as against a fabric tire of approximately equal size and costing \$43.90. Partridge Cords are more dependable and will give from two to three times the mileage of fabric tires.

Come in and ask to see Partridge Tires

W. B. PROWSE & SONS, Charlottetown

PARTRIDGE TIRES

to my left take good care that on any matter of consequence, on any vital matter before the people of this country, they do not become parties to any resolution that seriously reflects on hon. gentlemen across the floor.

Mr. Crerar: That was not true on the freight rates resolution.

Mr. Meighen: The hon. gentleman did what he could to acquiesce in the Government's proposal, but that question of from day to day, knowing that the putting of it off means additional freight rates daily to the people of this country, freight rates from which they should have been relieved before this.

Mr. Crerar: Where does my hon. friend find any warrant for that statement?

Mr. Meighen: He refused to support our motion which demanded that the Government announce its policy. Once the Government's policy is announced, that is all the Railway Commission needs, and the Railway Commission is delaying now because of the failure to adopt that resolution which demanded an announcement of Government policy.

Now I state that while the budget follows the protective principle, while no one could honestly dispute that it does—follows it as the old budget followed it—it is not in my judgment, without faults, and some serious faults. There are phases of the proposals of the Minister of Finance that I think carry with them menace to our business, our production and our trade. Indeed, I venture to suggest that we will find in committee the Finance Minister coming pretty much to the views that I shall now express and making some very considerable changes in these same decisions that are so loudly approved by hon. gentlemen to my left. I hope so.

I believe the absence of all special restrictions due to the depreciation of German and Austrian exchange is a mistake on the part of the Minister of Finance, and a mistake that he ought to correct. Germany today is one of the highest protected countries in the world, as is the United States, and Germany today is making marvellous progress, German minds, inventive as ever, have devised a plan by which they are able to maintain the mark value in their own country at a standard several times higher than it reaches for purposes of exchange; that is to say, citizens of Germany are able to get more in goods proportionately for their money than that money is worth in the exchange markets of the world, more by many times over. They do it first of all by multiplying mark production, a tremendous inflation of currency. They do it as well by the stabilization of certain of their essential articles of consumption. By these methods they have managed to put the working men of Germany in circumstances far more advantageous than those in other countries. That truth is recognized the world over. His condition has to be met; it has to be met by special provisions here. There may be another way of dealing with it better than the method heretofore adopted, but I do suggest to the Minister of Finance that something should be done, because if it is not done, the penalty is going to fall on large masses of the workmen of this country and to the practical advantage of none, in relation to coal and in relation

East or West
--Eddy's Best
--since 1851!

The LAST MATCH!
—you're out of luck if it isn't an EDDY match

"The end of a perfect day, and the last of a perfect box. I've looked forward to this pipe for hours."
"You've never failed me yet, good old Eddy, and I know you won't fail me now."
"I may lose my head at times, but yours is stuck squarely on your shoulders. As straight and sturdy as the tall pine you came from, you're a credit to the country that gave you birth."
"Many's the dark trail you've lit up for me, and many's the evening's meal I owe to you, Old Timer."
"You're more than a match—you're a light—as honest as the men who made you—a friend in need."

EDDY-TORIAL
120,000,000 matches a day—equal to 5,143 miles of matches, end to end.
Over 35 kinds of matches for every Canadian use.
35,000 feet of Canadian timber a day.
1,500 square miles of Canadian forest lands.
Over 75 acres of Canadian plant equipment.
125 tons of Canadian paper a day.
Over 2,500 Canadian workers.
\$2,500,000 a year to Canadian wage earners.
Over \$3,000,000 a year in Excise Taxes—over \$60,000 a week.

When the first sulphur match was made in Canada—**EDDY MADE IT.**
When the first non-poisonous match was made in Canada—**EDDY MADE IT.**
When the first safety match was made in Canada—**EDDY MADE IT.**

When the first silent match was made in Canada—**EDDY MADE IT.**
When the first self-extinguishing match was made in Canada—**EDDY MADE IT.**
When the first wax match was made in Canada—**EDDY MADE IT.**

EDDY'S MATCHES
THE E.B. EDDY CO. LIMITED
Canada