

KING VS. MEIGHEN

Reasons for Judgment:

The evidence in this case was fully taken. At the conclusion of the case, both parties were requested to put their arguments in writing so that their complete claims would be fully before me. Their written statements, fully set out in MacLean's Magazine of October First, clearly set forth the issues involved and there therefore remains nothing for me to do but to pronounce judgment.

I find as a fact that—
1—Whilst Canada has a huge national debt, it must dismiss free trade as an economic impossibility. This was admitted in writing by Mr. King.

2—I further find that there has been a great exodus of population from Canada to the United States.

3—I also find there has been almost a complete falling off in immigration.

Mr. King in his stated case did not deny and must be taken therefore to admit the truth of the facts on which the last two findings are based.

With regard as to whether the tariff policy as outlined by Mr. King and the Tariff Policy as outlined by Mr. Meighen will best protect the interests of Canada, I would point out Mr. King claimed there should be a tariff for revenue. He asserted that Mr. Meighen relied on the doctrine of high protection and he insisted that high protection means high taxation and that a moderate policy would tend to unify Canada and develop her natural resources and industries instead of setting one section of the country against the other.

Mr. Meighen stated that he stood out and out in favour of protection, profoundly believing it was the only policy to cope with Canada's present perilous situation; that it would give new life to industry and enterprise; provide necessary revenue and improve the Canadian market for its many productions. He ably argued that a firm protective policy is practically forced upon Canada through the higher protective tariffs of almost every country in the world, but particularly through that of the United States.

Mr. Meighen also argued that Canada must have manufacturing in order to provide employment for her people and from two to three hundreds of millions of dollars of goods manufactured in the United States and imported by Canadians could be manufactured within this country, and thus provide employment for our people.

It must be pointed out that Mr. King produced no evidence whatever in support of his statement that a tariff for revenue would meet the requirements of the country. Neither did he produce any evidence to show that high protection in Canada would increase the cost of living. Nor was there any evidence adduced by Mr. King to show that his moderate tariff policy would tend to unify Canada and develop her natural resources or that the policy of Mr. Meighen would set one section of the country against the other.

Accordingly I do find that Mr. King's allegations on these points are entirely unsupported by evidence. Mr. Meighen denied that protection would increase prices and taxation and he pointed out in support of his contention that in the United States where tariffs were increased about fifty per cent the costs of products and the cost of living have declined. He further pointed out that to prevent undue or unfair advantage being taken by manufacturers to increase their goods unfairly he would exert the machinery of the law to stop that sort of thing and showed that by a proper policy such advantage could not be taken.

Neither party made reference to a former case which the Court has in mind, tried in 1878, when the economic conditions in Canada were similar to the conditions existing today. It was proved then by overwhelming evidence that these depressed industrial conditions were almost wholly due to the low tariff policy of the Liberal Government of Alexander Mackenzie and it was also abundantly proved that the high protective tariff instituted by Sir John A. Macdonald immediately stimulated industries and agriculture and brought wealth and prosperity to the country.

I therefore hold that Mr. King's contention that a Tariff for revenue would meet the requirements of this country fails entirely as he is attempting to assert a principle which has been disproved by the United States and some sixty or seventy other countries.

With respect to the charge made by Mr. King that if a Policy of High protection were put into effect it would create violent discontent in the West, no evidence was adduced by him in support of this contention. Whilst Mr. Meighen admits that a protective tariff would not benefit all portions or sections of the Dominion equally, he proves, I think, conclusively that it would be possible for his policy to take care of those sections of the country which might labour under any disability, and I believe his assertion that the difficulties could be removed by means of transportation facilities and rates, so that the products of one portion of Canada would find a market in the other portions of the country, and the costs of manufactured goods could be equalized throughout the country.

I therefore find that Mr. King has not proved that a high tariff policy will create any great sectional differences, nor is there any evidence adduced by him in support of his oft-repeated statement on this point.

With regard to the statement by Mr. King that there is no industrial depression in this country, I find that the evidence produced from the Government records has abundantly proved the truth of Mr. Meighen's claim on this point. I question as to whether the high tariff would work hardships on the farmer as claimed by Mr. King. I am inclined to give much more weight to the argument of Mr. Meighen that there is no sense in letting the American farmer send his butter into this country by paying a duty of only four cents per pound, or a duty of three cents per dozen on eggs, or three cents per pound on cheese or \$2.00 a ton on hay, while our farmers send the same products to the United States paying eight cents per pound on butter, eight cents a dozen on eggs, five cents per pound on cheese and \$4.00 a ton on hay.

I therefore must find that if the Canadian tariff of 1924 and other articles was raised to be on a par with the Tariff of the United States, the Canadian farmer would benefit materially thereby.

I further find that on the statements of their policies on the tariff issue as set forth by Mr. King and Mr. Meighen as above and on the evidence and the findings of fact, that Mr. King's case wholly fails and his case is therefore dismissed.

Costs will follow the event.

"BLACKSTONE J."

Are you a Liberal?

Have you consistently supported the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy? Do you believe that Laurier and Fielding in their tariff policy were working in the best interests of Canada?

If you do you ought to vote against the King Government.

The King Government is not following the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy. It turned from that policy in 1924. Mr. Fielding's last budget speech was made May 11, 1923. In that speech he announced the Government policy of tariff stability. "The tariff," he said, "will be a moderate tariff and probably as low as the country can afford to have under present conditions. I think the country should be content to accept the tariff as it will now stand as one as fair and reasonable as can be prepared under all the circumstances and business men should be able to carry on their business enterprises without the fear of being soon disturbed by further changes."

In a year the Government changed its policy. Mr. Fielding became ill, his influence was gone. Mr. Robb's budget of 1924 put an end to any idea of tariff stability. It sounded the death knell of protection, said Hon. Mr. Stewart. It is only the beginning said Hon. Mr. Motherwell. Mr. King's speeches in this campaign bear them out. The Liberal-Progressive alliance in Ontario is another evidence. Ontario Liberals in since are supporting Mr. Drury, the free trader who would buy our steel rails in Germany. In about forty constituencies Liberals have no candidates and are supporting the Progressives. There is no doubt what they will do with protection.

If you are a Liberal and want to be consistent with yourself and your party traditions you cannot support Mr. King.

ARTHUR MEIGHEN.

according to the "New York Herald" is: "Industrious, sober, thorough, unassuming, precise."

Whilst Vincent Massey says:—

"I have a high personal regard for Mr. Meighen and admire his sincerity and candour, and I respect his courage."

In appearance:—Tall, thin, pale, thoughtful, intellectual.

Educated in Canada, Toronto University and Osgoode Hall, is pure Canadian by birth and education and was at one time a farmer. Married and has several children.

During the war was Cabinet Minister and a Crown Officer. The unpleasant duty of carrying out the conscription act fell on him. Being his duty it was accepted and carried out unflinchingly as Wolfe, the conqueror of Quebec performed his duty and said "It is no time to think what is convenient or agreeable; that service is certainly the best in which we are most useful; for my part I am determined never to give myself a moment's concern about the nature of the duty which His Majesty is pleased to employ me upon. I hope I shall conduct myself to meet with His Majesty's approbation." Scourged by Quebec for performing this duty, he has never been known to say an unkind word in reply. Was Premier of Canada for two years.

Makes few promises but if he gives his word, can be relied on to keep it.

Never boasts of past performances—preferring to let others do the talking.

Will be "The Man Who Came Back."

that the inspired policies of Cartier and Sir John A. Macdonald of Canada aim alone can aid and save this country.

PREMIER KING.

according to the "New York Herald" is: "neat, chubby, red-faced little becheur," inclined to be suave, dramatic and amusing.

Educated at Toronto, Chicago and Harvard Universities; was a protégé of Sir William Mulock.

Was Deputy Minister of Labour for several years. In 1914 went to the United States and was employed by the Rockefeller Foundation at large remuneration during the three years the United States was making billions by keeping out of the war. During this time he studied economic methods of helping the United States to make more money by settling labour disputes. In the dark days of 1917 "he was with Laurier" in the introduction of which he makes the statement that—Selfishness and Self-concern makes Human BEHEDNESS quite complete. Unable to settle the Great Canadian Strikes in Alberta and Nova Scotia.

In 1921 made many pre-election promises, but kept few.

Boasts that he will be proud to compare his war record with that of a hecker who asked the question. He went on to remark "I shall be proud to compare it with that of any man."

Will be "The Rover."

Believes it to be policy to place party advantage first. Has no en-

Vote For Canada

Historical.

It should, and we trust will be the ambition of every elector at the approaching election to vote for Canada. While we all should feel disposed to be friendly towards our neighbors, we are not called upon in this contest to promote their interests and neglect our own. It is therefore the plain duty of every voter to poll his vote for his own country. It is not hard to define where we stand. Do we desire National progress and prosperity? If we do, we should mark our ballots for the candidates who pledge themselves to build up our industries and protect our own hearths and homes. Our neighbors are in no need of our help when it comes to voting. They are well able to protect themselves.

The Conservative candidates are pledged to strive for the upbuilding of Canadian industry as the surest means of promoting prosperity and we believe a large majority of Canadians believe they are right and will support them, just as they supported Sir John Macdonald.

It does not follow that by adopting this policy there will arise any strife between us and other nations which pursue this policy themselves. To be consistent they are in duty bound to endorse such a policy. For this and sound business reasons they will applaud us, and stand prepared to trade with us in such commodities as they need and we can supply. But we must with a view to protecting our own interests, see that when they tax our goods we don't allow them to go Scot free, or practically so. There is not space here to go into details, but we presume the articles imported and which hold down our industries, have been described sufficiently to inform every elector of the facts in full, and will find it easy to decide who to vote for Canada, as the Conservative policy expounds it.

Some speakers quote figures at great length to illustrate their views. Such being the case may we quote a good story to illustrate the free trade policy as it has operated here in the Maritime Provinces, and especially in Prince Edward Island during the past four years. It is stated that in the early days in the Western States a trader built

known as a 6 ft. 11 in. Everything looked favorable until she got under way and it became necessary to blow the whistle, when alas! the boat stopped. The story shows that being exactly of the same measure meet when the whistle blew the steam had to stop. This whether a fact or a fiction exactly illustrates the achievements of the free trade craft in the Maritimes. The moment the Liberal leaders tried to sound their own whistle the free trade craft came to a standstill.

One wit's comment on the boat's misfortune was that "her's was a stationary engine," and the same will apply to the free trade craft all over the Atlantic region. We need not add that the free trade whistle has been heard all over Canada for the past month, but the 6 ft. 11 in. craft has been woefully still so far as industry is concerned.

The melancholy fact is that the Ottawa Government has treated the Atlantic Region for the past four years as if it did not know that we are a part of Canada. This Government was a "stationary engine" of the "purest ray serene," and now is the time for us to knock it into their heads with our ballots that we are a Province of Canada and

Ottawa that we do not blame Canada—our great country—for the wrongs we have suffered. The sins of the free trade Government must fall on themselves—on the "stationary engine." It will be sent flying in pieces on the 29th. Nevertheless, it is well to be on the alert in order to thwart any shifty tricks that may be resorted to in order to force free trade on the country for four years longer. Conservatives should endeavor to a man to persuade the people to

Vote for Canada, and Vote for a Live P. E. Island, And against Industrial Stagnation.



A drop on any excess sore or itching eruption and you'll be able to rest and sleep easy. Think—just a drop! It's worth trying! D.D.D. is a trial bottle today.

TO THE RAILWAY WORKERS OF CANADA.

Dear Sirs:

I am credibly informed that a whispering campaign is being carried on in the endeavor to misrepresent my views, and the attitude of the Conservative Party, towards the Canadian National Railway System and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

In order that there may be no doubt in your mind as to where I stand on railway amalgamation, I give you my personal assurance that I have never given the slightest support to it, and I will oppose, either in office or in opposition, Parliament dealing with the question of amalgamation, unless as an issue to be placed squarely before the people at a future election for their decision.

Increased population and traffic, and not amalgamation, are needed to solve Canada's Railway problem. My railway policy is bound up with a reasonable and stable protective tariff, bringing with it prosperity and increased railway earnings, thus assuring regular full time employment for Canadian railroad workers, as against short time now prevailing in many branches of the railway service.

With my best wishes for a prosperous future,

I am,
Yours very truly,

Arthur Meighen

(ARTHUR MEIGHEN)

Liberal-Conservative Victory Committee, 539 Bay St., Toronto 1