

think it a truthful estimate to say that about three-fourths of the manufacturers of Ontario are or have been Reformers, every bit as 'sound' Reformers as Mr. Mackenzie or Mr. Mowat, and these men bore up for years under the refusal of their party leaders to heed the country's call. Had Mr. Mackenzie but said the word when he went to the country in 1873-74, Reform candidates and Reform journals by scores would have thrown up caps and declared for Protection, and Sir John's opportunity might never again have come. But nobody knows, because it is something not to be calculated, what an amount of labour and energy was expended by Mr. Mackenzie and the *Globe* in keeping down and repressing Protection in the Reform party. The thing was rising naturally, and by reason of the country's circumstances, in the Reform as well as in the Conservative ranks, and the party tyranny that 'sat upon' and smothered it was simply tremendous. Why, all the labour of Sir John and his lieutenants 'stumping' the country and making speeches for Protection, did not equal the labour that fell upon Mr. Mackenzie and something less than a dozen of his friends, keeping down Protection in the Reform party. In the desperate effort to make the Reform party a Free Trade party they spent their strength, and at last they broke their own backs in the struggle. Left to themselves, Ontario Reformers would have been as good Protectionists as the most enthusiastic of Sir John's followers. After having endured for years a most tyrannical repression of opinion on the question, they turned at last upon their leaders, and voted them out of power.

It is the event of 1878 in Ontario which is the remarkable one, requiring explanation; that of 1879 is a matter of course, scarcely requiring any explanation at all. It was Reform votes that gave Ontario to Sir John A. Macdonald, last September, by a majority of 66 against 22. Protection

being secured, Ontario Reformers came back to their party allegiance, and sustained Mr. Mowat by 58 to 30. The surmise is a reasonable one that many of them felt sore at having had to vote against their party last fall, and were not only willing but eager to seize the opportunity of returning to their allegiance. The contention that the vote in favour of Mr. Mowat was a vote against National Policy will not hold water. The men who voted for Protection last year would have voted for it this year had they believed it to be an issue in the election. Some people said it was an issue, but the multitude did not believe them. Take the case of Hamilton as the *reductio ad absurdum* of the idea that the vote of June 5th was against National Policy. It is tolerably certain that, party politics aside, five-sixths of the people of that city are really and truly Protectionists. And yet they elected Mr. Mowat's candidate by a majority of sixty! To suppose that Hamilton, of all places, has gone back on the National Policy, is too absurd for belief. Nevertheless, it is not wholly a mistake to believe that the new policy has been somewhat injured in its operation by what appeared to be a vote against it. In the United States, and in England, it may give the impression that we might possibly be induced to change our decision of last year. Having adopted a certain policy it is our interest that people outside should understand that we mean to give it at least a fair trial, and, if they understand this, it will save them and us the needless waste of efforts of theirs to make us abandon it. The supposition that we can be induced to abandon it may cause them to expend much labour of aggression, and may put upon ourselves much labour of resistance, which would otherwise have been saved. Some intending investors may have had their enterprise chilled by the fear that, after all, the new policy may not last long, and that it might not be safe to risk much on its