

the forces of interest and plunder are never asleep and the records of the courts show conclusively that one party is as good or as bad as the other. It was not because the Liberal party was excessively virtuous that Canada had honest government from 1874 to 1878, but because its leader had the resolution and the courage to require honest administration by the public departments and frugality in the public expenditures.

For his resistance to protection Mr. Mackenzie gets more praise than he deserves. He was ready to raise the duties from seventeen and one-half to twenty per cent. So were Honourable George Brown and Sir Richard Cartwright and Honourable Edward Blake, and other leading Liberals of Ontario and Quebec. Principle does not concern itself with percentages. If Honourable A. G. Jones and the near-sighted, contumacious, anxious Liberal group from the Eastern Provinces, who were possessed by the delusion that they could not carry their constituencies if duties were increased, had not gone into revolt against Mr. Mackenzie he would have raised duties to twenty per cent., and once committed in Parliament and on the platform to the defence of higher customs taxation who can be certain that the Canadian Liberal party would not have become entrenched in the fortress of protection. There is reason to believe that if the Mackenzie Government had committed itself to higher duties the Conservative Opposition would have adhered to low tariff. The common story is that when Sir Richard Cartwright arose to deliver the budget speech of 1876 it was not known if he would declare for or against higher duties, while Sir Charles Tupper, who was to follow, knew only that he would not agree with Cartwright.

In a speech at St. Mary's in 1893, Mr. D'Alton McCarthy said: "There is no doubt in the world that we were out of power and by going in for the National Policy and taking the wind

out of Mr. Mackenzie's sails we got into power. We became identified with the protection policy, but if Mr. Mackenzie had adopted the protective policy we should have been free-traders." Mr. W. F. Maclean, M.P., whose father was one of the most convincing writers of protectionist literature at this period, has said that Sir John Macdonald was "timid unto death of protection", and "had to be bullied into it, led into it, committed to it by others". Mr. Goldwin Smith declares that when he warned Sir John that "Protection would never do for Canada" he was assured, "You need not fear that I am going to get into that hole". One does not understand how Mr. Goldwin Smith could give any such warning, for he was opposing the Mackenzie Government, petting Honourable Edward Blake as the repressed believer in a more liberal commercial policy, and cultivating close personal and political relations with the Conservative leader. In a letter to *The Toronto News* in 1901 Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin said:

"Now as regards Sir John Macdonald's opinion, he is on record quite early in his career on the side of protection. On the other hand, in 1876, I was in 'The Mail' office talking to the late Mr. Charles Belford, who was then editor under Mr. Patteson, who was manager and editor-in-chief, when Sir John Macdonald entered and said: 'Belford, what do you mean by that article on protection? I'm not a protectionist.' Belford replied: 'It doesn't commit you or the paper. It is marked 'communicated'.' But that policy is taking hold of the public mind, and that is the question on which you will have to go to the country.' The policy of protection was preached on platforms and advocated in 'The Mail' before Sir John Macdonald took it up heartily. He had undoubtedly gone over to free trade with the Disraelian Conservatives, and was fully aware what a hold belief in it had taken of the public mind. He, however, took to studying protectionists' books, and when he began to advocate protection he brought to bear on its popularization his fine power of illustration, sometimes homely, sometimes whimsical, always effective. It is the good fortune of the leading statesmen to get credit not only for the work, but the idea, whereas they are never the first to conceive the idea."