

a common pine door, worth three dollars, would scarcely pay the cost of transportation from France or England, and must consequently be manufactured at home. If there was no possibility, by improved machinery, to reduce the cost of making this article, it would be of little consequence to the farmer whether the carpenter made one hundred or ten thousand doors in the course of the season; his door would cost the same amount of labour, and require to be paid for accordingly, so that his only advantage from an extended market would be a better home market for his produce; but if by introducing improved machinery into his establishment, the manufacturer could produce two doors in the same time that it required under the old method to produce one, then the farmer would be enabled to purchase the article at just one-half its former price. Whatever, therefore, tends to lessen the cost of production, it is our duty and our interest to encourage. It is mainly on this account that we advocate reciprocity in manufactures. At the present time the limited demand for many kinds of goods prevents the introduction of the best methods of manufacture, and consequently compels the consumer to pay a much higher price than he would have to do were our manufactures properly developed. Thus, if the machinery required to make two doors instead of one cost a thousand dollars, and the demand was limited to one hundred doors per annum, it is clear that under such circumstances, the required machinery could not be introduced to advantage; but if the demand increased to one thousand doors per annum, then the manufacturer would be enabled to introduce the best machinery, furnish his goods at a much cheaper rate, and realize a handsome profit to himself. So it is with almost every branch of our manufactures. Considered in this light, the importance, nay, the absolute necessity of securing an extended market is at once apparent.

In seeking advantages which we do not enjoy, let us not forget those already in our possession. We have reciprocity in the products of agriculture; have we profited by this as much as we should have done? This is a question well worthy of our serious consideration. If reciprocity in agriculture has not resulted in the benefits anticipated, how can we expect better results from reciprocity in manufactures? Are our manufacturing advantages better than our agricultural? Certainly not.

Referring to the imports and exports under the reciprocity treaty, which will be found in the last and present numbers of this journal, while there is much room for congratulation at the increase in trade between the two countries, there is at the same time room for dissatisfaction. Possessing a soil and climate equal, if not superior, to that of the neighbouring States, with no large manufacturing cities of our own to supply, we are yet importers of a large amount of agricultural produce for home consumption. This is particularly the case as regards Western Canada, as we shall presently show. It is no wonder that money is scarce in this part of the country, when we import not only our manufactured goods from the other side, but our very beef and mutton, butter, cheese, apples, eggs and vegetables.

From the returns referred to, we find our imports of the following articles exceed our exports in some cases by a very large amount.