THE TORONTO WORLD

A One-Cent Morning Newspaper.

OFFICE: 12 MELINDA-STREET, TORONTO.
W. F. MACLEAN, Publisher.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

One Year - - $3.00 | Four Months - - $1.00
Six Months - - 1.50 | One Month - - 50
No charge for city delivery or postage.
Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.
PER EACH LINE OF AGATE TYPE.

Ordinary advertisements, fifteen cents per line.
Financial statements, twenty cents per line.
Condensed advertisements, one cent a word. Deaths, Marriages and Births, 25 cents.
Special rates for contract advertisements or reading notices and for preferred position.
The World's Telephone Call is 523.

THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 20, 1887

A Call to Freedom's Friends.

The public has had a good laugh at The Globe's hysterics of Tuesday last. The Deacon has perpetrated nothing funnier since he rolled up his majority of one and accused Sir John A. Macdonald of wrecking the Bank of London and the Ontario Investment Company.

Once upon a time there was an editor who boasted that he "wrote with his boots on," but his boots soon wore out from the constant friction. When a Globe editor gets hysterical he always creates the impression that he has been writing with his shirt off and his hair on end, like Katerfelto, wondering for his bread. Now that the faithful have been commanded to meet, organize, speak, protest, yell, howl and jump and kick with both feet, it will never do to let the agitation "die aborning." Toronto is the natural centre of political activity in Ontario, and here the initiative meeting which is to give impetus to the crusade must be held. There need be no lack of orators for the occasion, and chief among them should be the Deacon, Hon. Timotheus Warrenski Anglin, and Bro. J. D. Edgar, M.P., of L.O.L. 245, York. These gentlemen are all connected with The Globe and are the proper parties to initiate its policy, and raise "the wolf's long howl on Outalaska's shore." The World will guarantee them a crowded house to hear and see them meet, speak, protest, whoop, shout, rear up in front, tear up behind, snort, cavort, resolute, commit mayhem upon the blarsted British tongue, clutch the atmosphere, jump up and knock their heels together like the Bad Man from Wayback, and sniff the east wind, in the wild ax. Come, pentlemen, uncork yourselves. Shake off your lethargy. Burst your bonds. Bite the iron heel of effete despotism. Snatch the shirt of luxury from the back of tyranny. Smite the brazen brow of monarchy with a rotten egg from the "Burd of Freedum's" last year's nest! As The Globe has truly said, "delay is dangerous." Let the ravishing begin.

"The Blood of Our Young Men."

The Globe and The Mail are out-Heroding Herod in their truculency toward this country. Not even The New York Sun has displayed such impertinence as these Toronto renegades are displaying. The Mail tells us that we have no case in the fisheries dispute, and that if we refuse to admit as much we shall be gobbled up by our big neighbor forcibly or otherwise. The Globe, as if jealous of its rival renegade's zeal, takes up the parable with increased unction. According to it we must either accept Wiman's terms or endure commercial retaliation and probably invasion. It whines about the danger of "the blood of our young men being shed" by the invader. If the painful duty of repelling a foreign foe should ever again be thrust upon us, our young men will not neglect to dispose first of the renegades who run the rebel press in this town. We would at least leave no foe in the rear to mourn our victories or rejoice over our disasters. The dastards who are endeavoring to destroy our fishery rights and to hand our commerce over to the control of Congress may rest assured of that fact.

A deal The Globe cares about the blood of our young men. Those of them who shed their blood in suppressing The Globe's friends in the Northwest have frequently been attacked in its columns as murderous marauders who killed and plundered "the Queen's unhappy children, by bad laws condemned to die." It has branded Gen. Middleton as a horse thief and his troops as cowards. It lauded Riel as a patriot, and, in every way sought to create the impression abroad that those who put down and punished him were the vilest of the vile. The gang will find that "the blood of our young men" counts at the polls, and needs no battle field to make itself felt.

Trying to Terrify Us Into It.

The Globe, having started on its attempt to terrify all Canada into submission to a demand which is insolent if coming from one quarter, and traitorous if coming from another, is bound to keep it up. Yesterday it told us, most impressively, that we must submit *and* resign. That President of the French Republic, who was not deemed Republican enough to suit the place, was told that he would have to submit or resign; but Canadians are ordered at their peril to do both. First they are to resign their national independence, or that very considerable measure of it which they have already achieved; and, next, that they must submit themselves to the rule of the United States. There is "cheek" for you, we should say.

What we are threatened with is that if we refuse to accept the American interpretation of the treaty of 1818, with Commercial Union besides, then, as the New York Times says:

> The (American) Administration will have no course left save a resort to the retaliatory powers with which Congress has invested the President. These powers, if they are used at all, will be used, not merely to compel a recognition of the right of our fishermen to buy bait and ice in Dominion ports, but also a general right of American deep-sea fishing vessels to enter those ports for the ordinary purposes of trade.

In other words, commercial war will be declared against Canada in order that the Americans may obtain what they distinctly renounced by the convention of 1818. The Times thus proceeds:

> What results would come from a resort to the policy of retaliation, whither it would carry us, and where it would leave us cannot be foretold. But persons in the least degree familiar with the history of international disputes know that after retaliation has been resorted to and has failed, war is the next and only step—unless, indeed, the claims in dispute are abandoned.
>
> We think it will be well for the business men of the United States to consider whether it would be worth while for this country to put aside all other plans of settlement in deference to the views of a few high-tariff Senators, and then to resort to sweeping retaliatory measures, with all their possible and grave consequences, all for the sake of an annual "catch" of $4,500,000 worth of codfish and mackerel.

Of course with The Globe the wish is father to the thought. Its hope is that through fear of commercial war being declared against us, (possibly with war of another kind soon to follow) Canadians may be terrified into surrendering their National Policy of independence. But there are two things to be considered. First, it has yet to be seen that any Government in power at Washington would venture to carry out what The New York Times tries to bluff us off with: a something which even itself seems to doubt whether the country would authorize when it came to the pinch. And, again, whether if coercion is to be tried, Canada has really no recourse but to submit. Even The Globe sees an alternative which might be, for it says:

> Should the United States Senate interfere against a fair settlement reached by the commission, and should war thus become almost inevitable, The Globe would counsel "No surrender and God defend the right."

Even The Globe, we see, is obliged to contemplate a case in which it might be our duty to stand on our right, trusting to God to defend the same. Well, the friends of Canada's independence contemplate nothing more unneighborly or more defiant than that.

Meantime we feel quite sure that, taking things as they are, the intercourse going on between the two countries is, as a whole, more profitable to the States than it is to Canada. And we feel convinced, further, that the bulk of American business men understand the fact full well. Therefore we refuse to believe, until we see it—that the American people will allow any Government sitting at Washington to rush the nation into the folly and the crime which it is The Globe's delight to hold threateningly over our heads.

[For "An American Sunday."

On Monday night, in New York, nearly a hundred Protestant clergymen attended a meeting called for the purpose of taking steps against the threatened destruction of the "American Sunday," and the substitution for it of the Sunday of Continental Europe. The question is now prominently before the people of the State of New York in connection with the election of important State officers (the Governor not included, however) which takes place next month. Quite recently there was formed at Albany the "Personal Liberty League," having branches throughout the State, with the avowed purpose of bringing about such a change in the license laws as shall permit the sale of liquor on Sunday, from 2 o'clock in the afternoon until 12 o'clock at night. To this Protestants and people of American birth are, as a rule, determinedly opposed, while the change is demanded by citizens of foreign birth, and by the Germans most of all. The struggle will be in great part one between American and foreigner; complicated, however, by many other issues mixed up. It is almost certain that the Personal Liberty League men have been promised concurrence in their demands by the managers of the Democratic party, and that for that party's candidates their votes will be cast. Such being the case it would seem natural that the entire temperance and prohibition vote would be cast for the Republicans; but this is by no means sure. The Republican managers favor high license and the strictest enforcement of the law; but the extreme prohibition men will have prohibition or nothing. Last session of the State Legislature the Prohibitionists joined hands with the liquor dealers to defeat high license and strict enforcement bills, which were promoted by the Republicans. The coalition proved too strong for the Republicans, who were beaten in the fight of last winter.

But all is not safe and smooth for the Democrats either. The United Labor party, which is led chiefly by Henry George and Dr. McGlynn, has been badly slighted by the Democrats, and now vows revenge. Again, there is still another labor party, which is opposed to Henry George, and so precisely how the labor vote will go, and what it will amount to, remain to be seen. Already it is certain that the fight for "Personal Liberty" on one hand and for an "American Sunday" on the other will be a bitter one, and that it must extend to other States than New York.

Both Parties in Position.

Ottawa and Montreal correspondents of American papers have been sending to the journals they respectively represent extracts from Mr. Chapleau's recent speech. The correspondents agree that in taking the stand he did against Commercial Union, Mr. Chapleau spoke, not for himself alone, but for the whole Dominion Cabinet, which is a unit on the question. He who does the Ottawa news for The Chicago Times says:

> Mr. Chapleau is the first member of the Dominion Cabinet who has spoken in public on the question of Commercial Union, and in doing so he reflected the sentiments of the whole Cabinet. While the Liberal press of the Dominion are supporting the movement, the leaders of the Liberal party in Parliament have as yet been very non-committal, refusing to define their policy at present, but to wait for further developments.

But since this was sent off Sir Richard Cartwright's declaration *for* Commercial Union has been published; so that now the issue as between the Government and the Opposition is plainly before the people. It is not to be expected that either side will go back after this. Now for the tug of war.

An exchange is our authority for the statement that Mr. James Livingstone, Liberal M.P. for South Waterloo, is strongly opposed to Commercial Annexation as unpatriotic, disloyal and dangerous to Canada's best interests. "Jim" always had a level head for both politics and business, and is withal too good a Scotch-Canadian to wear the Wimaniac collar. With the Hon. James Young, Mr. Livingstone and The Galt Reformer opposing the fad it is not difficult to tell where Liberal South Waterloo stands upon the question. Mr. Livingstone says pointedly and well that those who are so much in love with the United States as the Wimaniacs profess to be had better remove thither and leave Canada to her own devices.

The St. John (N.B.) Telegraph is strongly opposed politically to Sir Charles Tupper, but it does not propose to prejudge his efforts as Canada's representative upon the Fisheries Commission. "The Telegraph will judge of his work by the results, not forgetting that there are many difficulties in the path, and that no one of the commissioners, however able, can expect to have everything his own way." Sir Charles' opponents on the Toronto press would find it more to their credit to do likewise, instead of endeavoring to tie his hands and encourage the opposite side to believe that they must and will have their own way.

The Mail will soon be a complete reprint in matter, as it already is in sentiment, of the American press. Last Monday it stole from The New York Herald two columns of cables from Ireland, dated them forward, and claimed them as its own.

Canada can of her own motion provide—as she has provided—for reciprocity in natural products, but she cannot adopt Commercial Annexation without Britain's co-operation and consent. Herein consists one difference between the two schemes, and a mighty big difference it is.

The Annexationists claim that Nova Scotia is riper for the acceptance of their scheme than any of the other provinces. They can prove the truthfulness of their claim by beating Sir Charles Tupper in Cumberland, failing which they will stand self-confessed of having added another chapter to their already large volume of false statements.

Belleville's Annexationist coterie of a dozen or so of screheads are worthy allies of the Toronto gang. While reading their reports of their meeting in the Annexationist press of this city we were impressed with the belief that those reports were tissues of falsehood, and now The Intelligencer confirms that impression. Our contemporary shows that at no time were there more than fifty people present, and that when the vote was taken the "crowd" had grown so small that the vote was only nine for to eight against the fad. And this most lame and impotent conclusion of a labored effort to organize the Annexationist forces in the city of Belleville is represented over the wires as the great outcome of "the largest meeting of the Board of Trade ever held in Belleville." The whole Wiman campaign has proceeded upon the theory that Mr. Wiman's control of the wires would enable him and his to falsify with impunity and make the worse appear the better cause. His and their conduct in this connection has been simply shameful and shameless, but it will not win.

While the battle on the liquor question rages, in New York and other States, Governor Bodwell, of Maine, comes out with the candid declaration that he is practically powerless to enforce prohibition. He says: "I am trying to enforce prohibition in Maine, but I find it is the biggest job that I ever undertook in my life. The law is fairly well enforced in the rural districts, and receives the support of the community, but in the larger cities and towns it is impossible to enforce it, as the liquor men defy it, and in many instances the local authorities conspire with the violators and accept bribes from them." The friends of high license and strict enforcement ought to feel stronger after this. If, after thirty-six years' trial, prohibition cannot be enforced in its birthplace and its pioneer home, where can the thing be done? An answer will soon have to be forthcoming. A mild liquor law, strictly and severely enforced, is probably what we are coming to.

That East End Block.

Editor World: I think the article in today's World, referring to the arbitration over the East End church block, is a fine argument in favor of the George system of taxing land. Your article says: "No building of any value has been erected on the lot in question." But, of course, the land is very much more valuable, and the church people think they should get the benefit of this increased value, while Ald. Fleming thinks he should have that privilege. But as a matter of fact, are either of these parties entitled to it? What has given that land its increased value? It will be generally conceded that neither of the parties who are now contending for the increased value have imparted that increased value to it. It is the people who have given it its increased value, and it is the people who should receive the benefit therefrom and not private individuals or corporations. This is the George theory, and if there is anything immoral or inconsistent in it I wish some one would point it out. In referring to your good-natured editorial hit at Henry George's opinion about land laws in heaven and your remarks on the copyright laws, I would like you to consider this point: that "Progress and Poverty" was written, or for argument's sake let us say made, by Mr. George, and therefore it is his property and he is entitled to any profits or increased value arising from its sale; but as to this East End block of land in question, the land itself, and its increased value, were not made by the church people nor by Ald. Fleming, and how then can they, either in equity or as a matter of justice, claim the land as private property or say that this increased value belongs to them? LANCE.

A Nut for Farmers to Crack.

Editor World: A great deal has been said by the supporters of Commercial Union as to the untold advantages to the agricultural interests of this country to be derived from the "larger market." To those who are being influenced thus to drop the substance for the shadow, the following words on the present wheat outlook on the other side from The New York Tribune may be rather interesting. After reviewing the estimates of foreign production of wheat and the requirements of the markets, it says:

> This country (United States) has probably about 411,000,000 bushels, estimating from the last report of the bureau, besides about 40,000,000 reserved for next year. The quantity exported in July of wheat and flour was equal to 16,689,880 bushels of wheat, and exports in August were also large; but it cannot be reasonably observed as the new supplies abroad are assured. With ordinary consumption for food and seed this country has on hand a surplus larger than was exported last year, while the improvement in foreign crops warrants expectation of a smaller demand from abroad.

Let us analyze this statement a little more closely. Our friend strays from the line, as it appears, have altogether, with what was left of last year's crop, about 479,000,000 bushels of wheat. Their home consumption will amount to about 355,000,000 and their exports to about 100,000,000. They will thus make it, the less Methuselah, plus over this year's trade of about 75,000,000 bushels or more than twice the entire wheat crop of Canada, even allowing an increase in our product of 4,000,000 bushels over last year.

Are the farmers of this country willing to hand over their home trade, which last year consumed about 90 per cent. of their wheat crop, (29,600,000 bushels out of 33,000,000) to be overwhelmingly slaughtered by this large American surplus; and receive in exchange a paltry increase of 10 cents per bushel on the exported 9,000,000 bushels of barley upon which they say they now pay that duty?

There is considerable talk about protected monopolies and coddled manufactures; but is there not monopoly in other quarters? Why should Canadians pay a higher price for their breadstuffs than the Americans? might well be asked, in answer to the many wails that go up from the supposed friends of the farmer, who would make him believe that he is the most heavily-taxed man in this community. Statistics show that the average price of wheat for the past five years in Canada has been $1.10 per bushel, while on the other side of the line it has only reached $1.03 per bushel.

While the farmer is seeking this "large market" for his barley, eggs and horses, he will have to secure at the same time a market for his wheat and other produce; for, even if our industries survive, and our manufactures, to a certain extent, continue, we shall all be bound to "buy in the cheapest market."

J. ACTON, 95 St. Patrick-street.

[Advertisement.]

Bell v. Gutta Percha Company.

Editor World: The Evening Telegram of Monday last contained a statement of one side of this case as presented before Judge McDougall by the lawer employed by the company. It requires no argument to show that such a statement, while not out of the way in a legal controversy, must necessarily be partial, partisan, unfair to the other side, and that its special publication in The Telegram must have been suggested by some inferior purpose, as it certainly cannot affect the judge's view of the law and the facts in the case. You are therefore requested to permit the statement, as briefly as possible, of Mr. Bell's side of the story through your columns. Last February he was dismissed from the employ of the company for alleged incapacity, and as his engagement with them did not expire until Aug. 1 last, he sued them for salary up to that date. The case was referred to Judge McDougall as arbitrator, and His Honor will report to the court above.

The first witness called by Mr. Bell was Robt. Haggert, manager of Haggert Bros.' manufactory at Brampton, who testified to the effect that his company had used over $10,000 worth of goods manufactured by Mr. Bell, all of which gave good satisfaction. Then came F. B. Mallroy, who testified that he was traveler for the Gutta Percha Co. for seven years, and had sold over 50,000 feet of hose of Bell's make, of which only 150 feet had been returned. He had also sold over 160,000 feet of belting of the same make, of which about three per cent. had proved defective, because the belt press furnished Mr. Bell by the company was defective, as proven by the evidence of the following machinists: Fred Doty, of the Doty Engine Works, stated that he had been called in a great many times to repair the press aforesaid, as it frequently broke down, and that Mr. Spadore, president of the company, had told him that the press was a poor one, but to do his best so that belting might continue to be turned out. The fourth witness was Jos. Patterson, the machinist of the G. P. & R. Manufacturing Company, who corroborated the evidence of the previous witness, and added that all his time was occupied in repairing the belt press. The fifth and sixth witnesses were A. Potter and L. Skinner, two machinists, employed in the rubber factory, whose evidence was to the same effect as Doty's and Patterson's. Wm. Frary was called, and deposed that he had charge of the hose department; he had never known of any defective hose, and he considered Mr. Bell a competent and thorough rubber manufacturer. It is significant that this witness was promptly discharged by the company for telling what he knew upon oath. The majority of the witnesses called by the company gave evidence favorable to Bell. It was shown that he had for 12 years been considered a competent man in the employ of the Boston Belting Company; and that he next took charge of the Boston Elastic & Fabric Company's works as superintendent; and after sixteen years spent in that position, became manager of the Mayall Rubber Company at Reading, Mass., and remained there until the factory was destroyed by fire. Mr. Spadane, President of the G. P. & R. Manufacturing Company of New York, wrote to Mr. Bell to go to Canada and take charge of their new Parkdale factory, where his superintendency gave so much satisfaction to his employers that at the end of two years he was given a mark of their confidence in the shape of an increase of salary. These are briefly the cold facts in Mr. Bell's case, and they are certainly not to his discredit either as a citizen or a rubber expert. EXPERT.

AN ALL NIGHT SESSION.

A TROUBLED MEETING OF THE WESTERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.

Discussing the Big Bequest of the Late Senator McMaster to the Proposed University, and the Denominational Standing of the Same—Choosing a Board of Governors.

One of the longest sittings of a church parliament on record in this city was that held by the Western Baptist Convention in the Jarvis-street Church yesterday and last night. A long debate took place on the bequest of the late Senator McMaster to the proposed Baptist University. The convention met at 9 o'clock yesterday morning and, with two intermissions for lunch and dinner, was in session when The World left the church at 3 o'clock this morning. At that hour seven out of the twelve Board of Governors of the college had been chosen.

Proceedings of the Convention.

W. J. Stark presented his report as treasurer of the Home Missionary Society. The total receipts, including the special fund for the superintendent, had been over $15,000, a balance of $1829 being due the Treasurer.

The report of the Year Book Committee, recommending the appointment of Dr. Stuart as editor, was referred to the Board.

Rev. James Grant presented the report of the committee appointed to consider the subject of Northwest missions. It was recommended that the Manitoba Convention report what appropriations the missions within its own limits would require and notify same to the Dominion Board quarterly.

A long discussion ensued on the subject, which was deferred.

The report of the Charter Committee on "McMaster University" was next taken up. As during the previous debate on the subject, Mr. D. Sinclair took the chair and suggested that as there were several delegates who might have to leave town before evening, the election of the Board of Directors be proceeded with.

President Thomson objected to this course. He pointed out that the election of the board was a matter of great importance, as the responsibility to devolve upon the board would be immense, and hence the necessity of withholding the appointments until it was clearly understood what the wish of the convention would be, that those elected might act upon it. The question of location, for instance, was one which a board of directors would scarcely undertake without instructions from their constituents.

Rev. J. Denovon held that having on the previous evening agreed to accept the trust according to the terms of the will and charter, they ought not proceed with the election of directors until they had first decided upon their line of action.

Rev. J. Trotter moved "That the denomination accept the obligation to organize and develop "McMaster University" as an independent school, recognizing the headship of Christ as the controlling factor." He argued in favor of a separate denominational institution.

Rev. James Grant moved as an amendment that "the convention do not express an opinion on the question of denominationalism, as the matter was not yet calling for immediate solution." He argued that the convention should be in no hurry in committing itself to the resolution of Rev. Mr. Trotter. It behoved them to act calmly and advisedly, and to leave themselves untrammelled. If the resolution were adopted and the convention decided to locate the university in Woodstock, the question of confederation would be shut out. The question of Christian education had been started, but not properly discussed. His definition of Christian education was that the Bible should pervade the establishment from cellar to roof. Confederation, however, did not preclude the possibility of a thorough Christian university. The Methodists had decided to go in for confederation, but that would not make it the less Methodistical. In the same sense, the Baptists might agree to confederation and not at the same time lower themselves as a Baptist denomination, or lessen their Christian ardor.

President Thomson asked that the matter should be fully discussed before any definite conclusion was arrived at. The words "federation" and "confederation" had been used very frequently, but a synonymous phrase would be "combination." The term "federation" was not specific enough, and they should be careful as to the sense in which it was used. There was nothing in the charter which would forbid federation of any class of students of the denomination, but there was something in the way of duty, as a denomination, which might guide them in the matter, and they as a denomination had no right to undertake the work unless they believed it to be the Lord's work. If, for instance, a brother came to bequeath a large sum of money to start a Baptist stove factory in Brantford in opposition to one in Toronto, he would refuse to accept the trust, on the ground that it was no business of their duty as a Christian denomination. Any scheme of federation which would prevent the Baptist denomination from having free and full control over the university would be an objectionable scheme, inasmuch as the denomination would be hampered in their freedom and independent action in working out their ideas. He thought they should first decide what they were going to have, and then where it was going to be—to decide where it was going to be before deciding what it was going to be was reversing the order of things. By such a federation as that of having the examination of students before an authority not appointed, by Baptists—such as having them examined in Toronto University, as was suggested in the case of federation—the denomination would lose its independence. It was an infringement of their independence were they to be but a medium of preparing students, on a standard dictated by others, for an examination conducted by those by whom the standard is prepared.

Dr. Stuart asked if they voted on the resolution of Rev. J. Trotter would it bind them for all time, and preclude them from federation in case such a course were deemed advisable at some future date.

Rev. Mr. Trotter interpreted his resolution as meaning independence, and opposed to the confederation at present proposed. Of course the resolution could not bind future conventions.

Rev. J. Denevon said if the action of the present convention could be upset by next year's convention, a great deal of time was being lost. In discussion, if, however, the decision of the present convention was to be binding, the subject should be fully discussed.

Dr. McVicker spoke in favor of a permanent settlement of the question as to whether there should be federation or an independent denominational university.

Several delegates expressed themselves opposed to the system of federation "set out in the charter of McMaster University." Until the resolution of Rev. Mr. Trotter, it