

continuance. But this feeling is even now rapidly passing away, as people realize that Mr. Mowat's Government has really no intention of going out of its sphere to attack the National Policy. The *Globe* deserves credit for its assurance, in which, doubtless, Mr. Mackenzie joins, that the new policy is safe for five years—that at least. If it gets so much, its friends need not fear what is to follow. Protection assured for a term of years will develop home production, and will so create new interests and enlarge old ones, that, when the time comes for the people again to vote upon the question, the thing will have taken such a grip of the country that to “budge” it will be impossible. That is what happened in the States, and it will happen in Canada too. Even Mr. Mackenzie or Mr. Blake, if in power five years hence, might think twice ere attempting to interfere with the interests which had grown up in the meantime, and had become in a manner public interests as well as private. It is a reasonable expectation that things will accommodate themselves to the new policy, and that even the Reform leaders will get to look upon it as something to be tolerated if not approved of. We might point them to an illustrious example, the bearing of which on their own case they will surely acknowledge. Thirty years ago Mr. Disraeli broke up the English Conservative party, and denounced Sir Robert Peel for yielding to the Free Trade agitation; now Lord Beaconsfield stands up in the House of Lords, and says that the verdict of the nation has been given, that this verdict must stand, and that the question must not be re-opened. It may yet—who knows!—be re-opened in spite of him, but his loyal confession that he was once wrong, and that certain “musty speeches” of his, made many years ago, do not represent his opinions of to-day, might be a good example for Mr. Brown and Mr. Mackenzie to follow. It would

be no loss of dignity for them to do as the great English leader has done, and to bow to the will of the people, or at least to let it be understood that the new policy shall have a fair trial, as far as they are concerned.

It is, as we have said, the event of 1878 in Ontario which requires to be considered and explained; that of 1879 is to be understood as a matter of course. A Province that has always had a Reform majority among its people once more elects a Reform majority to its local House—what wonder? But why did it elect a Conservative majority last year? That is the question, and the prevailing popular answer thereto is the right one; there is really nothing mysterious or recondite about the result. One thing Mr. Mowat would do well to consider—the Province has given him a very large majority, and has more unreservedly than ever before committed its local affairs into his hands. According to the entirety and implicitness of the trust reposed in him will be his responsibility. The public will expect something from him now, and they should not be disappointed. A still greater responsibility rests upon Sir John A. Macdonald and his colleagues, on account of their large majority, and it should be Mr. Mackenzie's patriotic duty to relieve them of none of it, but to let them carry it all if they can. Let Reformers in the Dominion, and Conservatives in Ontario, imitate the diplomatist who said that he always had a great regard for accomplished facts. The spectacle of a Reform Government ruling in Ontario, while a Conservative Government rules in the Dominion, is now being repeated, and by-and-by the country may catch the lesson which this is fitted to convey. That lesson is, that we should make up our minds to progress in the direction of withdrawing politics from the local Houses, and of making them more purely business assemblies. Some real reform, coming within Provincial