

and hewing down the trees of her forest as the sole occupations of her people. Those I have enumerated are all healthy, prosperous branches of manufacturing industries that need no protection and each of them assists in developing the natural wealth of the country. But while this is incontestable, it does not detract from the truth of the proposition that the commerce in agricultural and forest commodities adds the most to the nation's wealth. How unwise it is to protect manufactures cannot be better shewn than by inquiring which class adds most to that national wealth. The number of people in Canada engaged in agricultural pursuits in 1871 was 479,000, or about half a million; the number engaged in industrial occupations, exclusive of fishermen and lumbermen, being about 160,000. The precise numbers have probably altered since that date, but the proportion must be about the same. This proportion then may be assumed as about three agriculturists to one industrial. Now the export trade of a nation represents the surplus produce of the people's labour. Suppose we manufactured everything we require, produced all the timber and minerals, grew all the food consumed in the country, and exported a quantity of each class besides; then the exports would shew how much each class of produce added the most to our riches by seeking a foreign market which, in purchasing, would contribute to the country's wealth.

A comparison of our agricultural and manufactured exports, therefore, will show how much each adds to our wealth, and any difference in favour of agriculture is so much the more to be accepted, as we can produce all we use of that, while we are obliged to import a large proportion of the manufactured goods we consume. In 1879, our agricultural exports, including animals, amounted to thirty-four million dollars of Canadian produce alone (independently of re-exports of foreign produce), and our manufac-

tured exports of the same description amounted to two million seven hundred dollars; the proportion here is 12.6 to one; and, as we have seen, the agricultural to the industrial population is as three to one, it follows that each agriculturalist produces more than four times as much as each person engaged in manufactures. The same thing is true of the United States. It is therefore important to know what would be the effect of commercial union on agriculture in Canada. And this brings us to the main point of the discussion.

Canada's exports of agriculture (including animals) amount annually to \$40,708,000, of which \$6,979,000 is not the produce of Canada; and adding to this the forest exports, they amount to \$46,990,000 of Canadian production and \$7,515,000 not the produce of Canada, giving a total of \$54,505,000. Out of this \$36,700,000 are sent to other countries, and \$17,800,000 to the United States. Or, referring back to the beginning of this article, the exports to the United States form twenty four millions out of a total of sixty-eight millions. It is well known, however, that the United States are not importers, but large exporters of all the articles we have to send them. Let us try then to ascertain what portion of these exports are actually consumed in the United States, and what portion is re-exported or serves merely to replace a like quantity of the same articles exported by them. It is to the interest of Canada—at least to her commerce—that the goods she has to export should remain in the hands of her own merchants and forwarders until they reach the market of consumption. If, therefore, Canada exports to the United States what they re-export to another country, it is evident that she loses a good deal in the way of trade. By the table above given it appears, then, that the United States is our *best* market. 1. For gold and eggs, which are now admitted free of duty,