

years he has been in power, never had a majority from his own Province until the Dominion elections of 1879. But for the union of Ontario and Quebec, the former Province would undoubtedly have had almost a perpetual succession of Reform Governments, with nothing more than brief interruptions, if any. Even in the Union, Reform Governments would most have prevailed, and Sir George E. Cartier would almost certainly have made his alliance with Mr. Baldwin's successors rather than with Sir John, but for the split in the Reform ranks caused by the *Globe's* quarrel with the Baldwin Reformers. Upon that split Sir John worked with a dexterity of management akin to genius, but had not the material he required been thus opportunely thrown into his hands, he might have found it impossible to attach the leader of the Lower Canadian majority to his fortunes. But for the rise of the 'Clear Grit' party, and Mr. Brown's hostility to Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald, Ontario Reformers might have ruled old Canada in conjunction with Sir George and his friends; the circumstances which led to the coalition of 1864 might not have arisen, and Confederation might have been delayed nobody can guess how long. Looking at the political history of Ontario for forty years back, there certainly is no reason to be surprised at the Reform vote cast by the Province in 1879. The wonder would have been had the Province 'gone back' on its record by casting a prevailing Conservative vote.

Now this is exactly what Ontario did last September, and this is the result to be surprised at, and standing in need of explanation. The true explanation is the simple, popular, and generally accepted one, that Reform Protectionists on that occasion voted against their party leaders, and in favour of the Conservatives, on the issue of Protection alone. It is a gigantic mistake to suppose that Free Trade—one-sided Free Trade, at all events—is popular, or ever was popular with the

masses. The literature of the trade question is overwhelmingly on the Free Trade side; until recently it has been looked upon almost as a matter of course that editors, literary men, and writers of books generally, should be Free Traders. A man who did not agree with John Stuart Mill on this question was suspected of being stupid, and young men with literary or Parliamentary aspirations took to the Free Trade side almost as naturally as ducks to the water. Begging pardon of the Free Traders for the comparison, the reign and rule of their theory in English literature, for the space of thirty years, recalls the early triumphs and final collapse of Phrenology. May the gods avert the omen! they will say, but perhaps it is not to be averted, after all. When the gray-haired men of to-day were youths, in the early days of the Victorian era, they studied with admiration the new science of Gall and Spurzheim, and to them George Combe spoke as the prophet of a new age. The clergy were 'down' on the science, to be sure, because it appeared to do away with man's moral responsibility; but that was to be expected, and young men of literary tastes quickly settled the matter in their own minds in favour of the science and against the religious prejudices of 'old fogies.' Thus things went on for a while, and numerous 'professors' of Phrenology travelled from town to town, 'feeling bumps' and giving characters and charts at various prices, from fifty cents up to five dollars. But by and by it began to be observed that the new science was not adopted by the magnates of the medical profession, the great doctors who lay down medical and physiological law in London, Dublin, Edinburgh, and Paris. The preachers might be sneered at as bigots and ignorant of science, but this would not do with the real scientists who were laying bare the secrets of man's mortal frame. These men of scientific skill and hard facts coolly affirmed that it was simply ab-