

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—And the people expect it to be worse. It is all very well to say, 'We are a judicial body, a non-partisan body,' but the people know that senators nominated by the Conservative party vote for Conservative measures, except on very rare occasions as in the case of the Farmers Bank Bill, and in that instance they did it with the consent and probably on the instruction of the Government.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY—They did not; take it back.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I did not say that positively, I said probably. Everybody expects them to do it, and they do it. They look over to this side and they want non-partisanship. The Government proposes the measure, and if the majority of the House as at present constituted deems it advisable and necessary in the interests of the country and—I will limit it to the interests of the great Liberal party—to curtail demands of any minister or of the whole Government, we are told by the leader of the Government that if we do not accept the Government measure as drafted it will be withdrawn, they will kill the measure and smother the child, they will not have it live. Is that a dignified attitude for any government responsible to the people to assume?

The SPEAKER—I do not see how the hon. gentleman's remarks apply to the question of reducing the necessities of life, which is the matter before the House.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Of course, if the Speaker is the embodiment of the entire intelligence of the House I will have to bring my remarks to a close.

The SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the question before the House and not debate a matter that was dealt with yesterday.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—The facts to which I am alluding are parallel facts to illustrate the situation and I am keeping close to the subject. The hon. member from Halifax is justified in maintaining his ground. True we have no power to deal with the schedules of the tariff but it is our right and our obligation to criticise any proposition regarding the tariff. We are here to tell the people of this country what the Senate thinks of that question, and how will the country know what we think unless we put ourselves on record, not merely by arguments, but in an official way, and the only official way is by a vote. The appeal of the

Hon. Mr. MURPHY.

hon. member from Halifax is justified, and I hope he will stick to his gun. It is properly directed and has no blank cartridge, and he will find that he is not alone. I know that on the other side of the House our Conservative friends vote in a solid phalanx, and will oppose this measure, because the principle which it embodies is directly opposed to the policy on which they stand and on which they stood during the eighteen years they were in power. If the Conservative party on the other side find themselves obliged, owing to their allegiance to that principle and to their party to vote in a certain way, why should not the Liberals stand by the great principles which carried them into power in 1896 and kept them there for fifteen years? The Liberals throughout the country would feel encouraged by an official declaration by the Liberal party in this House in favour of the principle involved in the motion of the hon. gentleman from Halifax. I do not travel under a cloud; the principles that I advocate outside the House I advocate inside, and I want the people of the country outside to know that I am not afraid of my own shadow. I admire the cohesiveness of the Tories in their own ranks. I strive to the best of my ability to follow their example in that regard, but I regret in the Liberal party there is not that same strength of cohesion. That is the difference between us. It is needless to discuss the merits of the proposition further. We all know that a protective tariff is to the poor man's detriment and the rich man's benefit; but the Tory party will not admit that. The best statement made on the floor of the House in regard to this matter was the one made by the hon. gentleman from Lindsay (Hon. Mr. McHugh) when he said protection meant the enrichment of the manufacturers, and the impoverishment of the consumer. I hope the Conservatives will agree with me when I say that a protective tariff means the impoverishment of the national treasury, and the swelling of the bank account of the manufacturer. How does that come about? I shall assume for the purpose of argument that I am a protectionist; I am manufacturing a certain line of goods upon which I ask the Government to grant me from thirty to forty per cent. protection. With what result? The tariff on the line of goods I manufacture will not allow the goods from a foreign country to come in competition with me. I make them almost as cheaply as the United States,