

fishermen, the poor mechanics who work in factories. Do you think that this tariff will bring comfort to them? The tariff may mean much to a few people, but with the masses it is different.

I was brought up in the school of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding. I must qualify that, for Mr. Fielding had in him some little taint of protection, with respect to sugar for instance. In all sincerity and honesty I suggest that the right honourable the Prime Minister should mix a little among the masses of the country. If he did so he would learn that his tariff will not make the people contented and happy. After all, the best government is one which will legislate with due regard to the needs and problems of the day.

Hon. C. E. TANNER: Honourable senators, I am sure that the remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down have been very interesting and enlightening—although perhaps not in the sense that he intended—and that we all appreciate his very eloquent lecture on tariffs and other matters. I have no doubt that he was one of the elect who met at Ottawa in 1893 and declared by all the gods, dead or alive, that protection in this country was going to be torn up, root and branch. They passed a lot of resolutions to that effect, and printed them and scattered them abroad. I hope I am not wrong in assuming that my honourable friend was one of those present at the great convention of 1893 who were determined to lay the axe at the root of protection. Well, in 1896 the free trade party, headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and supported by my honourable friend, came into power. We have heard many invocations this afternoon, but will my honourable friend tell me whether that party of Sir Wilfrid Laurier rooted up protection in Canada? The Finance Minister of that Government was the late Mr. Fielding. He had made many speeches and declarations of policy in Nova Scotia while he was Premier of that province, and had pledged himself and his political career to the bringing about of all sorts of reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States. And as for protection, it was to be damned, cursed and obliterated from the country. But will my honourable friend tell me what Finance Minister Fielding and Sir Wilfrid Laurier did in 1897? Did they prove themselves to be honest and sincere men with respect to the tariff? My honourable friend knows that when Mr. Fielding brought down his tariff in the month of April, 1897, he had incorporated in it some of his free trade heresies, but that they never went into effect. What happened? I have no doubt my honourable

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX.

friend remembers. When Mr. Fielding encountered the tempest of opposition among his own friends and the industrialists of Canada, he walked home with his free trade budget, as he called it, and did not appear again with it until the 17th of May. Then he came in and candidly acknowledged—and I give him credit for it—that he had to restore the protection features on account of the pressure of industrial Canada.

Those features remained in their restored position, and my honourable friend supported that high tariff. Throughout the whole of his political career he supported it, for it was never changed. It was always high under Laurier. What is the use of the honourable gentleman coming here and preaching sermons which he never lived up to in his own political life? He has been talking to us about lower tariffs. Why did he not lower tariffs when he had the power to do so, or when he was backing a Government that had the power to do so?

Apparently the honourable gentleman has not yet got out of his head that old notion about going to Washington. All through the Laurier regime there was talk about going to Washington. Of course, Mr. Fielding was largely to blame for that, because he was politically crazy about continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity, and all that kind of rubbish. And we know—I do not know whether my honourable friend does—that Mr. Fielding and a few others drove Sir Wilfrid Laurier against his will into the reciprocity pact in 1911. We know further that the reciprocity policies of Mr. Fielding brought about the defeat of the Laurier Government. Even John W. Daffoe, who I think is a good authority on the subject, tells us in his life of Sir Clifford Sifton that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not want that treaty of 1911, but that Mr. Fielding and others forced him into it.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: The author forgot to state that Sir Clifford Sifton himself delivered a speech in the United States in favour of reciprocity.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Anyway, while the King Government was in power I heard my right honourable friend who now leads this House (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) time and again challenge Mr. King to say that if he and his colleagues had the opportunity they would again make that 1911 treaty.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Not one of them would say so.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: They would not say so then, and they would not say so to-day.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Fielding said so.