

The Advertiser

FOUNDED BY JOHN CAMERON IN 1863.

THE DAILY ADVERTISER.

(EARLY MORNING AND EVENING EDITIONS.)
Daily, by mail, per year (\$5 to 10 pages).....\$4 00
Daily, by mail, for three months.....\$1 00
All subscriptions payable in advance.

IN LONDON:

Morning Edition, \$5 per annum; Evening Edition, 10c per week, delivered.

THE WESTERN ADVERTISER.

(OUR WEEKLY EDITION.)

By mail, per annum.....\$1 00

ADVERTISING RATES

Made known on application at office. Address all communications to

ADVERTISER PRINTING CO.,

LONDON, CANADA.

JOHN CAMERON,

Press and Managing Director.

God's in His heaven,

All's right with the world.

—[BROWNS.]

London, Friday, February 8.

—We have an office cat who just

revels in the consumption of anonymous letters.

—Premier Bowell still asserts that he

cannot tell when the general election

will be held because he has a sore

throat!

—The fund for the support of Lady

Thompson now amounts to \$20,000. So

far no subscriptions to the fund have

been announced from this city.

—Justice to every section of the com-

munity, favoritism to none, are the

watchwords of the opponents of trade

restriction and high taxation.

—The Goderich Signal says that Mr.

Paterson, Minister of Militia, knows

he cannot be elected in West Huron,

and therefore will not run for that

constituency. It is asserted that Mr. Pat-

erson will take refuge in the Lieuten-

ant-Governorship of Manitoba.

—The Goderich Star argues that "the

pilgrimage in the desert of Opposition

is a long one, but better stay there an-

other term or two than go back on what

we have contended for as the truth."

But Mr. Marter holds differently. When

the people of London refused to endorse

the Conservative race and religious

cries Mr. Marter harked back.

—Talk about hard times among the

British landlords! We are informed by

London Truth that the new grand stair-

case at Arundel Castle, which is con-

structed of the finest marbles, has been

in process of erection for about eight

months, and it has just been finished,

and is said to have cost the Duke of

Norfolk upwards of \$90,000. And we

also learn that the Duke of Devonshire

is master of eight magnificent country

seats and town houses, a chateau in

France and a villa in the Riviera, with

many thousand acres of land bringing

him tribute. There is no lack of wealth

in Great Britain, only it is scarcely as

fairly distributed as it might be. Too

much goes to the landlords, who live

in idleness on their rents, and too little

goes to the real toilers—the workers of

the soil.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

The "Advertiser" has been asked re-

peatedly for its information regarding

the approaching Dominion general elec-

tion. Our position has not changed

for months. There will be no session of

Parliament before the dissolution. The

general election may be decreed any

day. The shivery-shaky Ministry dare

not face the investigations and the dis-

cussions of another session. It dare not

face an exposure of its deficit this year,

which promises to be \$4,000,000 or \$5-

000,000. It dare not face the revelations

of its Auditor-General's report.

THE HIGHER COURT JUDGES ON

THE LONDON SEAT STEAL.

The London Free Press has very fool-

ishly formulated another line of de-

fense for the London Seat Steal, the

discussion of which was re-started the

other day by Mr. Hume Elliot, son of

the judge-editor of our contemporary.

The Free Press argues:

(1) That the deliberate decision of

Chief Justice Armour, Chief Justice

Hagarty, Mr. Justice Street, Mr. Jus-

tice Falconbridge, Mr. Justice Burton

and Mr. Justice Macleannan was a "snap

judgment," and ought to be set aside

in favor of the decision of Judge Elliot!

(2) It argues that a number of the

bogus voters had valid votes, if their

cases, deliberately heard and disposed

by Mr. J. H. Fraser, revising officer,

could have been re-heard.

A few words in regard to these con-

tentions.

(1) Chief Justice Armour, Mr. Justice

Street and Mr. Justice Falconbridge

unanimously agreed that the original

notice to the bogus voters was suffi-

cient, and decreed that the revising

officer should, "pursuant to the Elec-

torial Franchise Act, forthwith proceed to

hear and dispose of the objections."

Mr. Fraser obeyed the law, as thus

laid down by the Court of Queen's

Bench. Was not this a unanimous con-

sensus of Judge Elliot's ruling that

the cases were bad? The lists were

for days the investigation went

on. Name was taken off by Mr.

Fraser to retain which there was the

most warrant. But the crafty men

did not want a purged list.

They did not win on it. They ap-

pealed. The Court of Appeal against

Chief Justice Armour, Street

and they united

in asking a decision

of the Court. They got it.

The most inquiry of all

the facts of the law, unanimously up-

held the Court of Queen's Bench, there-

by once more showing the illegality of

the decision of Judge Elliot.

Chief Justice Hagarty held "that the

amendment allowed by the revising of-

ficer," as granted and acted on by him,

"was within his power, and that the

notice so amended sufficiently comply

with the statute." The chief justice

went further. He said, "I think, on the

whole, that the unamended notice shall

be held sufficient."

Mr. Justice Burton said: "Speaking

for myself, I cannot say that I feel any

doubt as to the sufficiency of the notice

of objection read as a whole."

Mr. Justice Macleannan said: "We are

requested to give our opinion upon the

validity of the notices, and in deference

to the request I have considered

them, and I have no hesitation in say-

ing that I consider the notices suffi-

cient." This judge also severely re-

buked those who have been contending

that Judge Elliot's narrow, contradic-

tory, illogical and inequitable decision

is worthy of respect when he said: "The

object of the proceedings of the revis-

ing officer is to purge the roll of persons

not entitled by law to exercise the fran-

chise, and the attainment of that ob-

ject should not be bridled or defeated

by technical objections, or by a narrow

construction of the legislation, but

should be promoted as far as possible

without doing violence to the language

of the enactment. It would be an in-

tolerable scandal if in an ordinary action

in the High Court, such an objection

as we have here under consideration

could be allowed to defeat the rights of

any of the parties, and I do not see why

it should not be equally so in a proceed-

ing concerning the franchise." That is

the verdict of the six judges of the Su-

premier Court, and who that is fair-

minded shall not agree with the one-

time judgment of even our city contem-

porary, that it is a fair one? But Judge

Elliot, after pretending that he was

waiting to obey it, held differently, and

lo and behold! our city contemporary

flopped with him! It was one of the

sharpest curves on record. Our con-

temporary professes that it is in in-

ignorance of the views of the Superior

Court judges. It can profess ignorance

no longer. These disinterested jurists,

by their judgment, unanimously con-

demn the London Seat Steal.

(2) Our contemporary professes to be-

lieve that a number of the bogus voters

had good votes if their cases could have

been reopened. At the time the "Ad-

vertiser" published a list of the bogus

voters who voted, and challenged any

one of them to say over his own signa-

ture that he had a right to vote accord-

ing to the law. Only one of them es-

sayd to do so, and he proved that he

had no right to vote. But even if it had

been in accordance with law to reopen

the case of the bogus voters at the ele-

venth hour, and to have proved that

some who refused to attend might have

remained on the lists if they had so

chosen, would a rehearing of that kind

have been fair, unless a rehearing of the

cases of Liberal struck-offs took place?

Not once was it suggested by the de-

fenders of Judge Elliot that there

should be a reopening of the cases

on both sides.

We decline to be drawn into a discus-

sion of side issues, or of false charges

regarding the recent bye-election, in

which the Liberal candidate was elected

by 803 majority, and we repudiate in

the strongest possible terms the charge

of our contemporary that we have per-

sonally attacked Judge Elliot. Our ac-

tion has been taken purely on public

grounds. We joined in asking for a

full investigation into the serious

charges made against Judge Elliot and

his coadjutors. These briefly were:

That Judge Elliot was political editor

of the Free Press during the campaign

of 1891.

That in that capacity he took a party

stand against the Liberals.

That he professed to wait for the de-

cision of the Court of Appeal in order

to respect it.

That when the decision was given

and it was found that Mr. Hyman had

been elected by the legitimate votes of

the people of London, Judge Elliot, by

virtue of the power conferred on him

by the Franchise Act, gave the seat to

his opponent.

An investigation of those charges was

refused by the partisan majority at Ot-

tawa, and every independent journal,

Conservative as well as Liberal, con-

demned the refusal. The Free Pres-

s knows why all investigation was sup-

pressed.

LET'S HAVE IT.

It is a pity there is such prolonged

uncertainty regarding the meeting or

dissolution of Parliament. It is not

good for the country's business. Why

not determine and announce the choice?

—Ottawa Journal.

THE TAX ON IRON.

The Globe explains why the iron du-

ties are more objectionable now than

formerly. A duty of \$2 per ton in 1879

was increased in 1887 to \$4 per ton. In

the meantime iron had fallen in price

from \$20 per ton to less than half that

price. Thus what was once an ad val-

orem duty of 10 to 20 per cent has risen

to a monstrous exaction.

G. T. R. MEN ROBBED OF VOTES.

The revising officer's court now being

held every evening in the court house

afford many object lessons of the work-

ing of the Franchise Act. Under the

law a man has to prove that he has

earned \$300 the past preceding year in

order that he may be enrolled as a

voter. This provision has disfranchised

quite a number of Grand Trunk voters

in this city this year. Owing to the

short time which, from business depres-

sion, the company was compelled to

run, many of the Grand Trunk em-

ployes did not earn \$300 last year, and

consequently now find themselves with-

out a vote. The Dominion Govern-

ment's policy of restriction without

doubt contributed to the staggering out-

let of the railway business and made it im-

possible, in many cases, for the employ-

ees to earn sufficient wages to enable

them to qualify as voters. The Fran-

chise Act should be wiped out alto-

gether, and it will be after the next

election.—Stratford Beacon.

The Prerogative of Dissolution.

To the Editor of the "Advertiser":

One of the Ministers is reported as

saying that the time for the dissolution

of Parliament and the holding of a gen-

eral election is a matter of entire un-

certainty; that it may be now, or it may

be not till next spring. In the mean-

time the country is kept in a state of

political turmoil and commercial sus-

pense.

We glory in the popular character of

our institutions, which, we are told, are

more truly democratic than those of

the United States. It is surely not in

accordance with this boast that the

duration of our Parliaments and the

periods for our elections should be ab-

solutely in the discretion of the Min-

isters of the Crown, and that Ministers

should be allowed to use their power,

not for any national object, but for the

purposes of the party game.

The prerogative of dissolution is a

survival from a state of things very dif-

ferent from the present, when Parlia-

ment was of far more importance than

it is now, being not the supreme author-

ity, but a body summoned at the King's

pleasure to give information and grant

supplies to the Crown.

By the present practice members who