

It is evident that the short session yet remaining to the Forty ninth Congress to continue during December, January, and February will afford no time for revision of the tariff. That will remain for the Fiftieth Congress, which in the usual course of events will not meet until December, 1887. Then the problem of how to cut down the surplus revenue will have to be faced, and the Democrats, being in power, will have to face it. It is to this rapidly approaching necessity that Mr. Hiscock mainly draws attention. He wants the issue to come, fairly and squarely, and the sooner the better; but in his opinion it cannot in any way be evaded beyond the first long session of the Fiftieth Congress.

We wish we were equally sure of some potent, all-compelling necessity, which would do for Free Traders on this side of the border what Mr. Hiscock expects soon to see done for them on the other. We do not reproach them for their opinions—in this free country let both thought and speech be unfettered—but we do make this demand upon them, that they cease disguising themselves as half-and-half Protectionists, or something of that kind; and that they speak plainly, as honest men should, on the main question. We would meantime invite their attention to the fact that on our side there is positively no disguise whatever, not the first semblance. Men who are Protectionists glory in the fact, they proclaim it on the streets, and at public meetings everywhere. Instead of concealing their opinions on the tariff question they blazon the same forth in the light of day. Would that our Canadian Free Traders were equally honest and equally open in proclaiming theirs!

With the views of Sir Richard Cartwright, Hon. Mr. Mills, Mr. Patterson, of Brant, and Mr. Charlton of North Norfolk, the public are tolerably familiar. And as for these prominent organs of the party supporting these gentlemen, to wit—the *Montreal Witness*, the *Toronto Globe*, the *Hamilton Times*, and the *London Advertiser*—it would not be much of an exaggeration to say that they hate Protection “as the devil does holy water.” In season and out of season they denounce it as a fraud, as a villainous system by which the many are robbed in order to enrich the few. It is a relic of the dark ages, and wholly out of place amid the enlightenment of the nineteenth century. Further, it is antiquated, and barbarous, and opposed to the progress of the race, and it must disappear as the world becomes more enlightened. In the United States, in particular, where it did obtain a foothold about a quarter of a century ago it is now rapidly losing its grip, and Free Trade is destined ere long to have its most glorious triumph of all in the Great Republic. To be sure, there are before our eyes certain hard facts which flatly contradict these assumptions. France, Germany, and the United States are, next after Great Britain, the foremost three nations in the world in commercial importance, and their standing as *enlightened* nations is not to be disputed. Well, these three nations, instead of approximating towards Free Trade during recent years, have been going further away from it; and the duties they levy on British goods to-day are higher than their duties of forty years ago, when Cobden prophesied that Free Trade would shortly sweep the whole civilized world. The truth appears to be that along with progress comes keener competition between nations, as well as between individuals; and so keen does this international competition become that no nation has much of its custom to

spare for any other, but requires the whole for itself. Alike in France, Germany, and the United States the very spirit and purpose of the tariff may be expressed in these words:—“Our own home markets for our own home producers.” In not one of these great and enlightened countries is Protection established as a mere incidental, or “for revenue only,” but for its own sake. And, latest of all, we see the Democratic party, which two or three years ago gained a certain measure of success by keeping its Free Trade tendencies in the background, suffering a stinging defeat in the Congressional elections, and why? Simply in this way, we answer. Having a fair majority in the House, and having a Democratic Executive in power at Washington, they became bold, and played all sorts of tricks and antics in the way of tinkering the tariff, or attempting to do so. All the time the record of their hostile acts against Protection went on accumulating, it was not lost sight of by the people. And the result was a slap in the face to them from the constituencies, the most prominent enemies of Protection among them suffering the most. The Canadian journals above mentioned know these facts, but the veil is over their eyes, and over the eyes of the political leaders named, too. All the same they keep on denouncing Protection, and prophesying the speedy triumph of Free Trade.

Meantime, during the seven years and more since the National Policy was established, the general-in-chief of the Canadian Free Trade party—the Hon. Edward Blake—has said very little on the question. Now let us turn to what he did say at the recent demonstration of his friends in Toronto, on the subject in hand. We quote from the *Globe's* full report, which is of course the only authorized version:—

“I desire to refer very briefly to the attitude of the Liberal party upon the question of the tariff. It has been grossly misrepresented. In 1882 I stated my views upon that subject in the most formal manner, by means of the address I issued to the electors of West Durham as a manifesto to the country by the principles then laid down I still abide. I said:—

“You know well that I do not approve of needless restrictions on our liberty of exchanging what we have for what we want, and do not see that any substantial application of the restrictive principle has been or can be, made in favor of the great interests of the mechanic, the laborer, the farmer, the lumberman, the shipbuilder, or the fisherman. But you know also that I have fully recognized the fact that we are obliged to raise yearly a great sum, made greater by the obligations imposed on us by this Government; and that we must continue to provide this yearly sum mainly by import duties, laid to a great extent on goods similar to those which can be manufactured here; and that it results as a necessary incident of our so-called fiscal system, that there must be a large, and, as I believe, in the view of moderate protectionists, an ample advantage to the home manufacturer.

“Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute Free Trade.

“That is not the true issue.

“Free Trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, for us impossible; and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, or defective and unjust.

“I believe it to be in some important respects defective and unjust.

“We expressed our views last session in four motions, which declare that articles of such prime necessity as fuel and breadstuffs should be free; that the sugar duties should be so adjusted as to relieve the consumer from some part of the enormous extra price he is now liable to pay to a few refiners; that the exorbitant and unequal duties on the lower grades of