

In the same category should be placed the disparaging comment on the Cabinet constituted after the close of the session, criticism express and implied of the temporary government formed immediately after Mr. King's resignation without any reference to the undertaking that a permanent government with portfolios filled would be constituted immediately the session closed. Comment might also be passed on the absence of any reference to the imminence of the close of the session when the task of forming a Government was imposed upon me, and to the fact that had Mr. King secured the dissolution which he asked for the collapse of all pending legislation and the necessity of Governor General's Warrants, - things impliedly criticised when pertaining to us - would have inevitably followed.

What I call attention to chiefly is the following sentence on page 830: "Parliament was suddenly dissolved without following 'the procedure commonly adopted when a dissolution occurs with Parliament 'in Session, of attendance in person by the Governor General to announce 'dissolution to both Houses after giving the Crown's assent to all 'completed legislation'. This sentence would only have been written by an interested and willing collaborator of Mr. King's misrepresentation. The facts are that only on one occasion in Canadian history did dissolution occur with Parliament in session, and on that occasion there was no attendance of the Governor General to announce dissolution to both houses, there were no formal ceremonies and members learned just as they did last July "that Parliament had ceased to exist" "in the corridors from clerks and messengers". More over this precedent, which is the

KEIGHTON PAPERS, Series 2 (N.S. 2, I, Volume 3)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA