

ere met at the Ur trade between the two cour removed. Well this has h

farmers of New

have such an arrangement, now become such a great we should leave well enough alone. Well, we all admit that Canada as whole is highly prosperous. We all adm hat under the wise tariff policy intr fuced by Mr. Fielding as Minister of Fi cee by Mr. Fielding as Minister ; ce in 1897, the establishment flish preference, the adoption gorous immigration policy, the ajon ant of commercial agents in the y untries of the world, wherever it profitable to develop a profitable c Canada, our business has grown's

to quote the figures showing the increase in our trade. Let me give you the figures taken from the report of the department of trade and commerce, because they are worthy of re-petition again and again: Total trade between Canada and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland when this government came into power:

What was it at that time with th For year ending June 30, 1897-\* orts ..... 49,373,472 What is our trade with the United Kingdom today For the year ending 31st of March last the imports were \$109,883,168

137.158.71 What is our trade with the United States today?

For the year ending 31stMarch last the imports were......\$284,934,739 Or a total of ..... \$404.137.940

ods imported from the United

<section-header><section-header><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text>





MR. LOWELL, THE MAN OF THE PEOPLE, A SURE WINNER

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH, ST. JOHN, N. B. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER. 2, 1911

Kingdom last year free o ...\$25,424,627

States last year free of duty \$131,867,507 It has been properly a matter of con-cern to the government that the balance of our trade with the United States was so largely against Canada, shown by the fact that last year we imported from that country \$165,731,528 more than we export-ed to it. Therefore we welcome recipro-city because we believe it will tend to level up the trade between the two com-tries. Instead of sending them the un-manufactured log, which now goes in free of duty, we will send to our neighbors more of the manufactured product. In-stead of sending them the manufactured pulp wood we will send them more of the manufactured article in the form of pulp and paper, thereby giving employment to much additional labor in our country. With the tax on importations removed, we will send them more farm products and more fish, and so we will pay them by the products of our country for what the products of our country for what buy from them instead of sending em the gold. (Great applause).

## Sifton's Unfairness.

At Mr. Sifton's meeting in the Queen's rink, on Tuesday that gentleman most unfairly—and I cannot but believe with an entire lack of sincerity, for he must an entire lack of sincerity, for he mist know better—sought to make our people believe that reciprocity, which would give to the farmers of the west free access for their wheat to the United States, would be the means of preventing wheat pass-ing through the port of St. John and other Atlantic ports. This question must be considered in two aspects, first, as to the wheat which would be bought from our vestern farmers for home consumption: considered in two allows, and the point of the second, as to what would be bought from our western farmers for home consumption; second, as to what would pass over the line and be carried to United States ports for shipment to European markets. As to the latter, the complete answer is that the products of either are today and have been for years, allowed, under mutual bonding privileges, to pass freely through either country to be shipped through the ports of the other. The result of this privilege was that during the last winter port season at St. John about one-third of the total exports were United States products. Most of the imports for Toronto are, I believe, brough the ports, of of Priland and New York. It might just as well be said that under reciprocity all of oPrtland and New York. It might just as well be said that under reciprocity all the products of the western states would pass through Canadian ports as that all the products of Canada would pass through United States ports. The fact is that reciprocity will make no difference in this respect. The whole question depends upon the cheapness of and facilities for trans-portation and the Canadian railways and Canadian steamship lines can be depended portation and the Canadian railways and Canadian steamship lines can be depended on to flo in the future what they have done in the past, secure the buk of Cana-dian traffic and a fair share of United States traffic as well through Canadian ports. (Cheers). Think for a moment of the logical re-

sult of Mr. Sifton's argument. It is the the United States could at any time the past and could now, merely by takin the duty off of wheat, destroy Canada ports. I think better of the Canada transportation routes then to impedi transportation routes than to im-such a thing possible, and I am sure none of the great Canadian railway

<text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text>

1

