

“the speech from the Throne, but also afford encouragement and protection to the struggling manufacturers, and to the struggling agricultural productions of the country.”

This is the resolution, Mr. Speaker, which if I had the good fortune to have preceded my hon. friend from Montreal West, I would have moved, and which I intend to propose hereafter.

Now, Sir, at this late hour, and after the long speeches already made, I do not intend to enter into any long series of remarks on the great theories of free trade and protection; but one thing is very remarkable—that in all this discussion, and in all the various discussions which have taken place since the beginning of the Session, hon. members, or some of them, think that free-trade is political economy. Political economy in a great science; and a tentative science, as yet experimental—a science which embraces in connection with the political system, in the widest terms, all that concerns the material progress and prosperity of a nation and of all nations. Free-trade is a very subordinate branch of it, but it is a branch; it has been elevated, and it was raised in the time of Cobden, owing to the great success of free trade in bread, almost to be a religion, and since his death it almost seems that it has been degraded into a superstition; but, Sir, free trade, as has been said again and again *ad nauseam*, must be reciprocal. Free trade, free intercourse between nations, means what the word expresses; it does not signify that one nation must bind the other to that phrase, without regard to disturbing causes, or the situation of the nation itself, or of foreign nations, or the difference of tariff. Free-trade does not mean that a country, under all circumstances, must open its doors to all nations, no matter what their customs may be, no matter what their financial system may be, and without exercising any judgment, or using any guard, or employing any protection with regard to the country itself; this is not the opinion of any really great Political Economist. This view is perhaps held by the minor lights of the Manchester School;

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

but the great Political Economists have always admitted the existence of disturbing causes, and have always held that there are other things as important, and more important to a nation, than the mere aggregation of wealth, and the supremacy of free trade or protection. The collective interests of a nation must be considered. They are various, and a nation must stand on its own ground. Theorists, with regard to free trade, have laboured under a misapprehension, and have advocated a false science, opposed to the protection of the industries of a country under any circumstances. Now, that is not the opinion, as we all know, of John Stuart Mill. His celebrated passage, in his book, which has been so often quoted, I will quote again. It has been repeated by him in the last edition of his book in the same words that it was in the first. His position has been attacked; I myself have heard it assailed by political economists in the Political Economy Club, in England; but this man, superior, as we have been informed by the hon. member for Welland, to Adam Smith, lays down in this work, which he leaves as his legacy, the principle that there are circumstances connected with the manufacturing interests of a nation which not only excuse, but justify protection.

Mr. YOUNG—Two years ago when the question was up with regard to beet-root sugar, I quoted that very statement of Mills. My right hon. friend declared that on second thoughts, and on the advice of his friends, Mr. Mills had withdrawn that passage from his book.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman must be mistaken. If he turns up the last edition of this book he will find it there. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong. This is the passage:—

“The only case in which, on mere principles of political economy, protecting duties can be defensible, is when they are imposed temporarily (especially in a young and rising nation) in hope of naturalizing a foreign industry in itself, perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country. The superiority of one country over another in a branch of production often arises only from having begun it sooner. There may be no inherent advantage on one part, or disadvantage on the other, but only a present superiority of acquired skill and experience.