

those articles which we can profitably produce ourselves. That policy was laid down strongly by my colleague at that time, the present Hon. Sir Alex. Galt. He laid down for us the principle of a national policy, that we should consider our own interests only, and that in an adjustment of the tariff we should endeavor to foster all these various industries of which I have spoken. We steadily adhered in practice to that principle. Sometimes when the principle of free trade or a cry for a reduction of the pressure of taxation arose we had to yield. We were overborne occasionally, and had to make some steps backward, but on the whole, we held steadily to the principle and carried it out as strongly and uniformly as we could. We were forced at one time to reduce the tariff to a considerable extent; at another time, not very long ago, we took up the national policy, which has been made a matter of ridicule, and carried it, certainly not by a large vote. With a very short sighted policy on the part of the manufacturers of Canada that national policy was opposed by them. If they had known their interest they would not have joined in the attack made upon it, and if they have, to a certain degree, had it recoil on their heads, it is because they opposed it so blindly. I believed then, and I believe now, that the two must go hand in hand—that you cannot sever them. I believe it is the interest of the agriculturist to have a certain market at his own door. I believe it is not in the interest of the great agricultural community to be forced to look to a foreign market altogether for the sources of their prosperity and for their purchasers. I believe no nation has ever heretofore, or will ever hereafter, rise to any eminence in civilization, the arts and sciences, or prosperity of any kind, unless it honours agriculture and encourages manufacture. To be sure, we heard from the Finance Minister—a gentleman whose parliamentary courtesy is only exceeded by his financial ability—that it would have the effect of driving people from the country into the town. It is not every man can be or likes to be a farmer, and the man who is unwillingly made one will always be a

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

failure. There is no life in* the world in my estimation more happy and enviable than a farmer's, under the circumstances in which he is placed in Canada. It is a pleasant independent life, bringing domestic happiness and all that the expression implies, but still, all men are not to be farmers. There is the man of constructive genius, who feels that his function in life is to become an artisan or mechanic, to enter into a trade, or some of the other various pursuits. These aspirations of the young men of the country are not to be checked or discouraged. On the contrary, that country is the best and will be most prosperous where every man has the utmost freedom to choose that mode of life, and exercise the abilities God has given him freely and without limit. It would be almost pedantic to refer to the those of antiquity, but looking at all those which have been civilized in the earliest history, sacred or profane, you will find that wherever a nation has merged from barbarism they have built up great cities. So it is in modern times; look at the Hanseatic towns, the commercial cities of Italy and the Low Countries. But it is said, as a reason why we should not encourage manufactures, that it has a tendency to induce young men to leave the country and go into the towns. Why, the policy of the Government will not keep the young men chained as serfs of the soil in our land. Their policy will not send them into our towns, but into the towns of the United States, where they encourage all kinds of mechanical pursuits. We have heard a great deal about this "Chinese wall." As I said a little while ago, the principle of protection to a moderate extent is justifiable, and the true principle of political economy. If you build this wall it will be like a dam which backs up the water of a stream until it overflows the country and does a great deal of mischief, but if the dam is raised so as to allow a moderate part of the water to go over, that water can be used for fertilizing, manufacturing, and for other good purposes. Therefore, the proposition I would hold up is simply that the dam should be raised high enough not to retain the water altogether, for that would ravage the