

surd, with any passable knowledge of the brain and its functions, to suppose that the bit of brain which was called Destructiveness had any mode of acting by itself, apart from that other bit called Benevolence, and declared that the so-called organ of Amativeness was nothing of the kind, but a nervous centre directing muscular motions. Under the contempt of the great doctors Phrenology died out, and now we hear very little about it. Now it appears to us no baseless conceit merely, but something really founded on facts, that the book-studying public of thirty or forty years ago took to Free Trade much as the young men of the same period took to Phrenology. The thing was new, and had a scientific look about it; what more natural than that it should be embraced by 'literary fellows' generally? But what in the name of common sense has all this to do with the recent Ontario elections? Let us endeavour to answer.

The belief in Free Trade, which rolled in like a great wave upon the educated classes, did not strike upon the masses of the people, either in Canada or in England; hence it happened that, while almost every man who wrote either books or newspaper articles, or made speeches in Parliament, was a Free Trader, the people generally had no opinion on the subject, or were inclined, if at all, to the Protectionist side. Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Brown, having read Mill and Cobden, were Free Traders, but to nine-tenths of the farmers and working men who cast Reform votes, it appeared utterly unreasonable and injurious that we should allow American importations free, or almost free, into Canada, while our exports to the States were burdened with heavy duties. Politics aside, there were not probably five farmers out of a hundred on the average in all Ontario, who did not believe that the right plan would be to put upon American produce exactly the same duties that the Americans put upon ours. The Reform leaders put the doctrine of Free Trade

almost on a par with that of the Bible, but the literary glamour which affected their eyes had not fallen upon their followers. This want of harmony between the leaders and the rank and file did not particularly matter in former contests, when Protection was a mere side issue, not much mentioned, and crowded out of sight by exciting questions of party politics. But the hard times, and the continued refusal of our neighbours to reciprocate our foolish liberality, brought the question of Protection to the front, and then the coherence of the Reform party was put to the test. The truth is that the masses of the people, the country's actual producers on the farm and in the factory, never were Free Traders, and never will be. It was their simple, unstudied belief that a country became rich by producing as much as possible for itself, and that it became poor by buying too much abroad and running in debt for it; and they could not comprehend how a nation was to gain by such relations of income to expenditure as would ruin individuals. They believed, further, that while bookish theorists might hold that it was for a nation's interest to give Free Trade to its neighbours, whether they reciprocated or not, the thing had to be utterly rejected by every practical man, possessed of common sense. The ballot allowed Reform voters to vote as they pleased, free of the dictation of their leaders, and they voted for Protection. Nor is the case sufficiently stated when the prevalence of Protectionist views among the masses is spoken of. Many prominent Reformers, members of Parliament and others, were Protectionists at heart, but had been whipped into the Free Trade traces by Mr. Mackenzie and the *Globe*. It is the real truth that, through the logic of events and the force of circumstances in Canada, the people generally, Reformers as much as Conservatives, were being led to look to Protection as the right policy for this country, whatever might be best for England. We