

pared with which the old one completely pales its ineffectual fires.

Let us look back at that time for a moment.

There had been several years of hard times ; there had been a series of annoying deficits in the budgets ; there had been a good deal of interference with the regular business of our manufacturers caused by the large importations from the United States, the Government had raised the duties on manufactured articles two-and-a-half per cent. ; there was a very general demand for a further increase of the duties ; there were many of their own most influential supporters who urgently pressed for an increase in certain branches of manufacture which were clearly suffering from the 'slaughtering' ; and the Government themselves were seriously thinking of making the increase. They wanted more revenue badly. They could have had it by raising the tariff another two-and-a-half per cent., or more, on some articles, without violating any principle of political economy, and without departing from the precedent laid down by themselves but a short time before.

If the Opposition had declared such a Policy to be the entering of the thin edge of the wedge of Protection, as they had done before, Mr. Cartwright could have answered with the most perfect truth, 'Not at all, gentlemen. I am by principle a free trader, but I must have so much revenue ; and I think the people of Canada would prefer to pay their taxes in such a way, that in paying them they may give incidental protection to their fellow countrymen engaged in manufacturing industries.' He might have said : 'I want to have as few restrictions upon trade as possible, but the people are not prepared for direct taxation, nor do they want a principal part of the taxation to be levied upon their tea, sugar, coffee, and other things, which must in any case be imported ; I can't get any more out of whiskey and tobacco ; I must

have the money, and therefore I will raise it from these other imports.'

He might have left their raw material free to manufacturers, and they would have been better satisfied than they are to-day. He might have left coal free to tens of thousands in Ontario, who are cursing the coal tax to-day. He might have left flour free, to the great relief of the Maritime Provinces ; and he might have omitted all, or almost all, the unpopular and oppressive incidents of the 'National Policy' tariff, which owe their existence to its having been framed as a purely protective one. Why did he not do so ? I suppose Mr. Mackenzie and others thought they would be violating some principle if they did, and that they chose to go down into the cold shade of opposition, rather than appear to give way to what they must have considered to be a baseless clamour. The result was what many of us expected. During the contest, the Reformers generally adhered to their party leaders, and those who saw the blunder they had been guilty of on the tariff question, preferred to remain silent upon it rather than do anything to bring back the unrepentant Pacific Scandal Minister to power. But the demand for some measure of protection was too strong, and too many were willing to overlook the old delinquencies of the Tories, for the sake of getting that protection which our party had, upon principle, denied them. The people, in short, overlooked the crime of one party in order to punish the blunder of the other.

And that blunder has been, unfortunately, persisted in from month to month and from year to year, so that the Liberal leaders have been under the necessity of appearing to rejoice at every supposed evidence of a lack of prosperity, and to belittle and dispute every indication of the return of good times. They had to argue with one breath that the National Policy, inasmuch as it was a protective tariff, would destroy the revenue from the