

reciprocity in natural products—would that be profitable to Canada? This is too hard for me to answer; doubtless larger markets always benefit the producer. . . . But is it for us to talk of tariff reduction to the United States?" Mr. Russell talks later about "being fair." Is that expression a fair statement of the case? Is it not the United States Government that wants to talk to us? Had they not already extended the invitation, and despatched their agents to Ottawa for that purpose?

Mr. Russell then goes on to say the United States tariff barrier is 50 per cent. higher than ours, and that in the 10 years our purchases of United States goods were \$1,600,000,000. What does that mean? Does it not mean that Canadians wished those goods; that they were anxious to get them; that, in fact, they were able to suit themselves better with United States goods than with similar goods obtainable elsewhere. As already said, if the manufacturers had their way, the people of Canada would be placed entirely at their mercy.

WITHIN OUR RIGHTS

Mr. Russell thinks that the farmers did not present the right kind of petition. He seems to think we should have flattered the Government, and told them we had great confidence in their ability and statesmanship, and diplomacy and all that sort of thing. Well, farmers are not given to flattery.

In view of the standing offer upon the United States tariff list, for free interchange of agricultural implements with any country which would extend a similar privilege, and that President Taft had already intimated that he hoped letter trade relations between the two countries might be commenced through a free interchange of natural products, and the decided action of the two Governments for a further tariff conference, was it not a timely proceeding, on the part of the greatest industry of this country, that its patrons, the farmers, should intimate to our Government something as to what farmers might be able to get, and what we would also be pleased to enjoy?

We don't need to tell the Canadian Government that we have confidence in them, and that as self-respecting Canadians we knowance anything that is not a fair deal. We know the Government and the Government knows the farmers. Ontario agriculture has never made any request of the Canadian Government that is not reasonable and just, and I repeat, it was an eminently timely move, on the part of agriculturists, that we should acquaint the Government of our views and desires upon the question of reciprocity. The past history of the action of the Manufacturers' Association proves that if they thought they could obtain further favors at the hands of the government, the present tariff would not satisfy them for a moment.

OUR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Mr. Russell asks: "Are we to sacrifice our seaports to those of New York, Boston, and Portland?" Surely he has little confidence in the enterprise and business acumen of the Canadian people, and still less in the results which must follow the vast expenditure of the Canadian Government upon transportation! If the great benefits which ought to flow from our vast expenditures upon a Canadian system of transportation to the markets of the world will be brought to nought by the mere stroke of the pen of the United States Government in reducing or abolishing the Customs tariff of their country upon natural products, then the Canadian people may well cry out, "Lord help Canada."

What are the facts? I take as my authority George W. Stephen, President of the Montreal Harbor Commission, and one of the best authorities upon the continent on the matter of transportation. When we know from his testimony

that "from Oswego to the sea by New York, it takes 54 hours by boat, while from Prescott on the Canadian side it only takes seventeen hours, and that Canada, by the St. Lawrence route, has the further advantage of being 500 miles nearer Liverpool from the St. Lawrence than its United States rivals; when we know further that in shipping by way of the St. Lawrence to Liverpool, there is a clear saving of four days on the round trip when compared with the New York route, do not those arguments of Mr. Russell appear childish indeed? When we know further that according to the same testimony the cost of freight shipped by rail is nine times the cost of freight shipped by water, and that Canada is geographically so favorably situated that with the completion of railway and inland canal systems, she can so advantageously and effectually

Russell "shrinks from the very thought of the consequences which would result from a system of free trade." He says: "If such a policy were adopted we would see such a period of stagnation in Canada as we have never known. What industrial establishment would expand? What new ones be founded?"

What are the facts? Canada's foreign trade in 1910 was \$693,000,000. Of that total over one-half, \$352,000,000 jumped over an adverse tariff wall, between Canada and the United States. As J. J. Hill puts it, "Is that not once a tribute to the power of natural trade laws, and an indication of the only rational trade policy! It points to full reciprocity in natural products, which can harm neither country, and is just as certain to benefit both as has been the internal development of each, un-



A Bunch of Ontario Dairymen, Members of the W. O. D. A.

Some of the members of the Western Ontario Dairymen's Association as assembled at Stratford recently, are here shown. In the centre of the front row may be seen J. H. Scott, Exeter, retiring president; to his left, Frank Herra, Chief Dairy Instructor for Western Ontario; standing fifth from the left of the illustration is W. W. Waddell, the new president of the association. "A better dressed, finer looking or more intelligent lot of men never assembled in the town," says one of the Stratford papers.

compete for, not only the East and West bound freight of all Canada, but a large part of the United States freight as well, why do our friends so far discount the better judgment of the Canadian people, as to think they will be frightened and diverted from the clear path of national duty, by any such argument as Henry M. Whitney and themselves may see fit to present.

WHAT WAS ASKED FOR

But Mr. Russell is clever! His mode of escape from the discussion of the great benefits which will flow from the gradual reduction of the duties upon British goods was wonderfully facilitated by his altogether erroneous reading of the provisions of the farmers' second request. We never asked for "reciprocal free trade with the United States in all manufactured goods the farmers use." That was a misrepresentation.

The request was for "reciprocal free trade in agricultural implements, machinery, vehicles, and parts of each of these" (meaning, of course, farm machinery), and of course, the great benefit resulting from a further gradual lowering of the duties upon British goods, would compel our United States cousins to meet the more favorable British prices in our Canadian market. This would be a boon to the great body of our censuring population.

Following the example of Sir George Ross, Mr.

hampered by any tariff embargo between individual states and individual provinces."

ARE OUR MANUFACTURERS DEPENDENT?

These expressions of Mr. Russell show that if the tariff duties are lowered, he has no confidence in the resource and ingenuity and business ability of the manufacturers and business men of this country. We do these expressions no injustice in saying they mean that the very heart and stability of the manufacturing life of Canada is dependent upon the substantial margin which our Customs tariff allows them to take from the large body of consumers and put in their own pocket. If this is so (although I cannot so look upon it; I believe that our captains in the field of Canadian industry and our business men have as much enterprise and as much resource as the business men of any country), it is the strongest proof that our industrial life is simply a burden upon the people, and it would pay well to pension their workmen and remove the incubus.

A lower tariff wall between the two countries would further stimulate the inflow of United States capital and United States manufacturing industries. We have more natural advantages for manufacturing in Ontario than anywhere else in America. We have the pulpwood, iron and

(Continued on page 11)