

had not been loyal once upon a time, but they had become loyal. He said that he was almost going to be killed because he was loyal. That could not have been attempted except by disloyal men, and I am sure he would say that none of his political friends are disloyal. There is more than one way of hinting at a thing that an hon. member does not want to state openly.

There are just one or two points in the hon. member's address to which I wish to call attention. I may have misunderstood him, and if so, I wish to be corrected. I understood him to say that it was a mistake to lower the duty on agricultural implements; that we could get better and cheaper implements if the duty had not been reduced. I also understood him to say that the amount of the preferential tariff made no difference, and if the whole of it was taken off it would be all the same. Now, let us see where we stand. First, as to the agricultural implements. If they can be got cheaper and better with a duty of 35 per cent than with a duty of 20 per cent, I would like the hon. gentleman to show where the 15 per cent reduction would go.

Mr. WILSON. Oh.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) has an explanation, I would like to hear him give it.

Mr. WILSON. Frost can explain it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). And that is the proof. All the eulogy pronounced on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) is pronounced on a man who says that 20 per cent is enough.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he does not.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). He does say so; and, more than that, he says that his factory never was so busy as it is now—that they cannot fill their orders. Now, if taking off 15 per cent from the duty has had the effect of bringing worse implements here, what does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) say to the fact that, with that reduction, this great factory cannot overtake its orders? I come to the second point—I am glad I did not misunderstand him—that the preferential duty made no difference if the whole of it was off. What does that mean? That is to say, that if our average duty of 18 per cent against Great Britain were wholly taken off, it would make no difference, it would not help us any, there is no good in it. Now, I suppose we could follow that with every country in the world, because if it makes no difference with our trade relations with Great Britain it cannot with the United States. I am glad I have got a convert at last to my radical views; for here is a gentleman who says: If you take the whole of it off it won't make any difference, we will be better off. The

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) and myself have a splendid accession this afternoon to our radical views. With his free trade notions, and with his loyalty, he will make a follower of which any leader in Canada might well be proud. It just shows the nonsense that is being spoken. Now, we are agreed upon that, that is to say that in the trade of a country 10 per cent of a reduction in the tariff paid by the people makes no difference. Follow it up in any business you like. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House or out of it, or anywhere outside of the insane asylum, who will say that a reduction of 10 per cent in his expenditure makes no difference? For, after all, governments do not differ from individuals. The government who saves 10 per cent from the tariff it imposes is exactly in the same position as an individual that saves 10 per cent on what he purchases; and when hon. gentlemen opposite say that it makes no difference, why, they are treating not only their own friends but all the people as if they did not really understand that two and two make four. It may not be enough, Mr. Speaker; the reduction of 10 per cent may not be as large as it ought to be; but in the name of common sense let us say it is 10 per cent when we are all agreed upon it, and then let us go on to discuss it. The calculation is as plain as day, any school boy can make it, that a reduction of 10 per cent on the tariff imposed now as compared with the tariff that was in force in 1896, amounts to \$3,000,000 a year more. Does any hon. gentleman say that that is no reduction? Now, you see we may be floating on oceans of words without coming down to a given principle.

I said a few moments ago that it is a legitimate argument for every member in this House to make whether 10 per cent is enough. I have no hesitation in saying that I would be ready for a greater reduction. I believe that we should go further. But very pertinently I ask this question of my Conservative friends: Are they ready to go further? Is there a man among them who will say we have not gone far enough in the interests of the people? He dare not do it. Now, we have cleared the ground away so far as that is concerned. First of all, the present tariff differs by 10 per cent from the old tariff, and let us discuss it from that ground. There may be a difference of opinion whether that 10 per cent, in its relation to the trade of the country, and when taken by individual items, is as beneficial to the people of this country as it ought to be. That is a matter we may fairly discuss. So we have the first standing ground as between the two parties. The party opposite by their tariff would put on 10 per cent more, and we have reduced it by 10 per cent. Secondly, we have the further position that the party opposite would not dare to go any further. Now, let every