

to Great Britain? Did it ever occur to these gentlemen that we were never taxed anything by Great Britain? Did it ever occur to them that while she spends millions upon millions on her army and navy she asks nothing from us? Did it ever occur to these gentlemen that the security granted to a Canadian was as great as if he were born within the shadow of Balmoral or Windsor Castle? And if, perchance, in any country in the world he suffered an affront or was badly used, he had, as a free-born Britisher, the protection of every man in the army and every gun in the navy as much as if he were a king on the throne in Great Britain? Do we not owe something to Great Britain? But there was more than that. By the preferential tariff we were not helping Great Britain, we were helping ourselves. Is it not worth something to have a third of the duty upon an article removed. This is the first time in my life I have heard the opposite doctrine preached. Fancy the hon. member for Addington going into a store to buy an article. He is a prosperous farmer, and he knows the value of money. There is an article in the store that last year he paid \$1 for, and he goes in now and the merchant hands him the article, and he hands the merchant his dollar, and he thinks it is all right. But the merchant gives him ten cents back.

Mr. WALLACE. He charges him \$1.50.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not need to answer. I just stood for a moment in pity. The hon. member for Addington gets the 10 cents back. I ask him: Would he fling it in the face of the man from whom he got the article and would he pay a dollar for it? Of course he would not. Now, the trade with Great Britain stands exactly like that in so far as the duty is concerned. Here is another thing. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to make any distinction between the sum total of the price that it cost to produce the article plus the duty in one year, or another. Now, they state that we pay more for some articles. Naturally we have to because there is more competition and more demand, but, let me repeat what I said before, and it is that there is no man in reason who would say, that, if there is a reduction in duty, we do not get the article that much cheaper, or who would say that it costs more because we pay less duty. Did anybody ever hear of such folly as that? Of course, articles are dearer. Take iron, for instance. I have said that the works of New Glasgow are experiencing a marvellous change for the better. Iron went up in price, and the industries have increased everywhere. Why is it that the farmers are so prosperous? In the first place they produce more, and in the second place they get a larger price, and they are, consequently, able to pay more for the articles they consume. Would hon. gentle-

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

men opposite want to have it so that an article produced by the farmer should sell at a high price and that the article produced by the artisan should remain at the same price that it was before? Do not hon. gentlemen opposite understand that when times are good and when the price of one article goes up the price of another article also goes up in order that the labourer who produces that article shall receive more for producing it. Of necessity with such a state of things up go the wages of the artisan. I was up, the other day, in the Niagara peninsula and you cannot get a man to work there for less than \$1.50 a day. I am not claiming that the good crops are due to the act of the government, but, if hon. gentlemen opposite had had the chance how much would we have heard in that line? Suppose, in 1896, the Liberals had been defeated, that we had had three deficits and bad times, and that the Tories had come in! Suppose we rose in our places and said that all the prosperity you have is because the farmers have had good crops, and by the way, is it not an extraordinary thing that good crops for the farmers make good times everywhere? We always maintained that. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: No, we will make the country rich by making it a manufacturing country. While there were only about 15 per cent engaged in manufacturing industries, there were 65 or 70 per cent of the people engaged in farming, and they were to go on feeding the 10 or 15 per cent of the people. I think the government have acted wisely in adopting the tariff that we now have, because they have considered both the manufacturers and farmers, and have not gone upon the principle of considering only one class. Every man has a right to be considered. Suppose, as I said before, that we had not succeeded in 1896, and that the Conservatives had been returned to power! What would the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) have said? I think I hear him speaking with that vigour that characterizes him, and something like this would be the result: In 1896 the country was almost in a state of bankruptcy, every industry was paralyzed, men were out of employment, three deficits was the record of the Liberal party, the farmers were in a state, almost, of poverty, they could not pay their bills, but at the general elections, what happened? Why, a change came over the country. The sun, that before refused to give its full heat to the earth, gave out in plenty. Rain fell in plentiful showers, and kindly mother earth opened her bosom because she was now ruled over by the Conservative party, while she had refused to give forth her abundance when the Liberal party was in power. Words like these, repeated in various forms, by hon. gentlemen opposite would be the result. In so far as the crops have been better, that is a good result, and we must look