

—confidence in the Government, instead of reliance upon personal, intelligent use of the means of information within their individual reach—is unworthy of the dignity and responsibility of members of Parliament, elected as representatives of the people of independent and intelligent constituencies. And what is true of the members in relation to their respective constituencies is equally true of every intelligent individual elector in each constituency, at least within the range of his own personal observation and experience. It is as ignominious for the individual citizen to leave a question so vital to the well-being and progress of the Dominion to the opinion of his representative, as for the latter in his turn to throw the responsibility for using his own brains and doing his own duty upon the Government. What the country needs, in Parliament and out—what it must have if it is ever to develop its resources and prove itself worthy of free institutions, is citizens capable of doing and resolved to do their own thinking on all those great questions which stand so closely related to the life and growth of the commonwealth.

It is not our purpose here to attempt to prove or disprove one or another of Mr. McCarthy's propositions. We would merely insist with all the force at our command that it is the duty of every good citizen to satisfy himself, by the faithful use of all available sources of information, of their truth or falsity. It is surely competent for any intelligent elector to inform himself by personal observation and investigation whether injurious combinations and monopolies have been formed under shelter of the tariff; whether that tariff has in many or in any instances proved itself burdensome to the great mass of consumers; whether it presses unfairly upon large or small sections of the population; and whether it is producing among such discontent, verging on disloyalty. It is doubtful whether more important questions were ever before the Parliament and people of Canada for decision. Dr. Montague made some observations, which, if we rightly apprehend their meaning, were intended to describe Mr. McCarthy's resolutions as intricate and vague. They seem to us, on the contrary, to be admirably clear and direct, and we think they will appear so to every reader who has taken the trouble to look at them at all closely.

Is it or is it not true that the price of cotton fabrics has not fallen in Canada to a degree at all proportionate to the fall in the price of the raw material, and of the cost of manufacture—that, in other words, Canadians have to pay for articles of clothing made of this material a good deal more than the sum for which articles of equally good quality could be procured in England or the United States, plus the difference in cost of delivery? Is it true that farmers and other consumers of iron goods in Canada are obliged by the tariff to purchase agricultural implements

and other articles made of an inferior quality of iron at a greatly increased cost? Is it true that the price of an article in so common use as wall-papers is enormously enhanced by the protective tariff? Is it true, in a word, that on the average the cost of goods manufactured under the National Policy is increased to the extent of thirty per cent. to the consumer? If not, is it increased twenty per cent., or fifteen per cent.? Mr. Ives is reported as having said in his speech that it was not possible to show that a farmer with a family of seven would have to expend twenty dollars a year more because of the N. P. Twenty dollars a year! Did Mr. Ives stop to think what twenty dollars a year means to the ordinary farmer, or to any other man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow? He would probably admit that the additional cost of living entailed by the tariff would be greater for most other families than for that of the farmer, for no other produces anything like the same proportion of what he consumes. But take twenty dollars as the average. Assume that there are the equivalent of 700,000 such families in Canada. The people are, then, mulcted to the tune of \$14,000,000 for the benefit of the protected manufacturers! That is to say, fourteen millions of dollars are transferred from the pockets of the many to those of the few by act of Parliament.

No intelligent person will be deceived by the fallacy, so constantly repeated by the advocates of protection, of assuming that the amount of the tax paid under protection is represented by the amount of the revenue derived from a given article. The tax is often heaviest when the revenue is smallest. There is just one short and decisive way in which to determine the amount of tribute exacted for the protected classes in the case of a given article. That way is by finding the answer to the question, what would be the price of that article or one equally good if imported under a revenue tariff? That can, in many cases, be easily ascertained. The answer, sought and found, should settle the question of the future fiscal policy of Canada.

COLERIDGE.—I.

It has often been remarked how difficult it is for the later age to understand the secret of the influence of books or of men of earlier times. We are told that a certain book was epoch-making, that it gave men new thoughts inspiring them with fresh ideas, whilst to ourselves its contents seem a mere matter of course. It is not difficult to explain this seeming difficulty. That which was new to our fathers has come to us through many channels as the accepted belief of educated men. We have absorbed it into our spiritual system, and when we go back to the source from which it flowed, we find nothing of novelty in its utterances. The revelations of an earlier generation are the commonplace of a later.

For this reason it is difficult for young men of the present time to understand the feelings with which the writings of Coleridge were regarded forty or fifty years ago, when books like the "Aids to Reflection" and the "Biographia Literaria" were fountains of fresh and living thought to eager souls who were striving to solve the hard problems of life. Yet there are few who have even the most superficial acquaintance with the current of English theological and philosophical thought who can be altogether destitute of interest in this great writer. A great writer he was, and a vast and almost universal genius, if he cannot be called a great man. If his infirmities were manifold, his intellect was vast. An exquisite scholar, an omnivorous reader with a most retentive memory, a politician, a philosopher of wonderful insight and compass, a profound theologian, and a poet whose place must be assigned to the first rank. It is related of the late Lord Tennyson that he had declared: "If Keats had lived, he would have been the greatest of us all;" and it may well be believed that he should have held such an opinion of a poet who influenced his own genius more directly than any other; but we may confidently assert that, if the genius of Coleridge had free and full play unimpeded by constitutional infirmities and depressing habits, he would have been not merely in potency, but in fact, one of the greatest of English authors. As a matter of fact, his life was maimed, marred, unsatisfactory, although the products of his genius were vast.

It may be worth while to support the judgment here expressed by testimonial evidence from authors of eminence. They are taken almost at random, as they have come to the writer's hand, and could easily be added to. Hazlitt declares of Coleridge: He was "the only person I ever knew who answered to the idea of a man of genius. . . . The only person from whom I ever learnt anything." De Quincey spoke of him as "the largest and most spacious intellect. . . . A most original genius." We will try to forgive Hazlitt and De Quincey some harsh things written of Coleridge for the sake of these testimonies. Professor John Wilson (Christopher North) said, "If there be any man of grand and original genius alive at this moment in Europe, it is Coleridge;" and Walter Savage Landor made the strong assertion that to Coleridge "Byron and Scott are but as gunflints to a granite mountain," while Shelley declared that he was "a hooded eagle among the blinking owls." Wordsworth, while lamenting his weaknesses, recognized his transcendent genius. "All other men," he said, "whom I have ever known are mere children to him, and yet all is pained by a total want of moral strength." Perhaps this is a little too strong; but here is the rift within the lute.

Let us understand clearly the state of the case. The evil in the life of Coleridge has been exaggerated. Perhaps it has also been extenuated. To a large extent the evil was beyond his control. But however it may be explained or excused, his life was marred, and so was his work.

It is a prodigious mistake, however, to say that Coleridge did little or nothing. Even his printed writings are of considerable extent and of profound interest. The late T. N. Talfourd remarked during the