

manent, will be the means of preserving it in the future.' Now, with all humility it is submitted, that an ordinary observer with his two eyes in a normal condition would conclude, if he thought as well as saw, that a party which had created such a policy, would find its natural function in maintaining it, and protecting it against a party pledged to an opposite policy. Mr. Norris is no ordinary observer, if he thinks that the Conservative party, which, after taking part in securing Confederation, has, under the leadership of Sir J. A. Macdonald, devoted itself to working out the problem of Canadian national life, and promoting its growth and development, will not, as time passes on, find work almost, if not quite, as important as the creation of a National Policy, and the construction of a National Railway. It is very generous to say, that 'we have received from the Conservative party all we could expect and more;' but the writer quite fails as a political Seer, in supposing that 'the Conservative party, like its chief, is drawing to the close of its existence.' Principles do not die when a teacher passes away or goes off the stage, and the Conservative party will not perish, so long as we call this country the Dominion of Canada.

The remarks made by Mr. Norris, with respect to Sir J. A. Macdonald, manifest a feeling of bitterness and want of charity, which unfits one for a calm and impartial review of Parties. And, from one posing self-complacently as a Canadian *par excellence*, a better spirit might have been expected. How does Mr. Norris know that Sir J. A. Macdonald, had been 'approached before he was appointed on the High Joint Commission' to treat at Washington, and is it just and honourable, or unjust and dishonourable, to say that 'it is possible that he (Sir John) had the promise of his K. C. B-ship in his pocket before he left Canada?' Mr. Norris is in favour of the National Policy; but he will not allow that Sir John Macdonald deserves any thanks

for its introduction. He says, Sir John never anticipated the success at the polls which he met with. 'With his usual cynicism, he placed his reliance on the differences and jealousies of the people of the different nationalities

. . . . Pocket and patriotism combined made it the winning card.' Now that may sound nice to Mr. Norris, but it has no meaning in view of the facts fresh in the minds of the people. What, in the name of common sense, was it, if not the contention for a Canadian National Policy by the Conservatives, under the leadership of Sir J. A. Macdonald, which carried the elections in 1878? It was because the differences and jealousies of the people were forgotten in the overwhelming demand for such a National Policy. Those who know best can affirm that Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party did anticipate success. A more inappropriate epithet could not be applied than that of cynic to Sir J. A. Macdonald. Mr. Norris has got Sir John and Mr. Blake so mixed up, in his efforts to disparage one and give the other a character and purpose he does not possess, that he forgets the plain facts of yesterday. In pursuance of this course towards these two gentlemen, he insults the intelligence of the people of Canada, by hazarding the statement that the previous character of Sir John Macdonald 'leads any one to think that the good of Canada was no the object of the National Policy;' and in support of this absurd statement, he refers to Sir John's course with respect to the Supreme Court, as if the one had anything to do with the other. After this we may cease to be surprised at the statement that 'the success of the National Policy deterred Sir J. A. Macdonald from repealing the Supreme Court Act,' and then in the following sentence, 'that it is probable that next Session we shall find him putting this threat into effect.' According to Mr. Norris's logic, as the National Policy is successful, Sir John was deterred, and as it will continue to be