

sacrificed the interests of the country for the sake of remaining in office? May I remind my honourable friend that the late Government could have remained in power for practically a year and a half longer, had it so desired, but it dissolved Parliament and appealed to the people. The Government conscientiously believed that it had done the best it was possible to do. When I look back upon that Government's record during the last eight or nine years, I only hope that the present Government will be able to show similar results after four years.

My honourable friend from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) has perhaps not been in attendance during these last days. We have passed a measure for the relief of unemployment, and the purpose of the one now at its last stage is to increase the powers of the Governor in Council with a view to reducing competition from abroad. We have acceded to these measures because we feel that the Government has a mandate from the people. We are to have presented for our consideration a Bill for increasing customs duties, and although honourable members on this side have expressed their objection to the principle, they will not oppose that Bill, because it is their desire not to thwart the apparent decision of the electorate. This is surely the first time in Canada that a tariff experiment has been made along such lines. The duties are being raised from 25 to 150 per cent higher than those now existing, and the Government contends that the cost of goods to the consumers will not be increased, because manufacturers have made a promise to that effect. I know of Conservatives who have said, "We are taking a big risk, but we shall see what comes of it." I fear that even if the manufacturers are sincere, conditions will arise within a few months, or certainly within a year or two, which will prevent them from keeping their promise. It goes without saying that if there is any appreciable increase in the cost of raw materials the consumer will bear the cost. And if there is no competition to keep the prices of manufactured articles within reasonable limits in this country, I wonder what will happen. The slightest pretext will be seized upon for the purpose of increasing profits.

Some years ago I was privileged to meet a number of important men of the financial world under the roof of the late Mr. Roosevelt, at Oyster Bay. There was also present a delegation of free traders—and fair traders—from the British Parliament. The question of protection having come up casually in con-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

versation, an American gentleman stated that he sat as director on the boards of many industrial companies, and he felt somewhat uneasy because most of those companies could sell goods to the people of the United States at higher prices—as much as 25 per cent higher—than could be obtained in foreign markets. That was the result of protection, and he seemed to doubt that the people of his own country were getting a fair deal. I had already heard similar expressions of opinion from other sources. Well, the present Government has assumed the risk of raising a high tariff wall and trusting to the assurances of manufacturers. The proof of the pudding will be in the eating, and we on this side of the House shall wait and watch, hoping fervently that this country will not be injuriously affected by the new tariff policy.

Hon. G. D. ROBERTSON: Honourable senators, I wish to make a few remarks by way of closing the debate. I am indebted to my honourable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) for the generous feelings that he has expressed towards the new administration, which is attempting to improve conditions for our own people. The debate on the motion for the third reading of this Bill has brought forth a number of interesting and useful opinions. Certainly no one can say there is any stifling of free speech in the Senate of Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I think that the attitude of my honourable friend opposite is a wise one. Well do I remember that the right honourable the ex-Prime Minister, when he became the head of Government in 1922, urged, and indeed pleaded with, Parliament not to criticize hastily the new administration. I remember that during the session of 1922 the Opposition purposely refrained from criticism; and in 1923 the then Prime Minister, having been in office more than a year, asked for continued freedom from criticism, on the ground that his experts had not yet completed their investigation into fiscal matters; and he promised that when the reports of the experts were presented the Government would formulate a definite fiscal policy. That policy was not announced until March, 1924, roughly two and a half years after the general election. I therefore feel, in the present instance, that if honourable gentlemen on the other side were inclined to be critical of the policies proposed by the new Government, they should remember what happened when the late Government took