

London Saturday Advertiser

VOL. XXXI, NO 207.

SATURDAY EVENING, JUNE, 23, 1894.

WHOLE NO. 9914

Coming Victory!

For 22 years Sir Oliver Mowat has been upheld by the votes of the good men and true of the Province of Ontario.

He has had against him in times past strong men and united parties. But he came off conqueror every time.

To-day, hardly a man of any eminence has appeared on the platform against him.

To-day the political party opposed to him is broken up into a dozen factions.

In one-third of the constituencies of Ontario there is no straight Conservative candidate in the field—a confession of weakness and disintegration.

A certain number of nondescripts favorable to Mr. Meredith may be elected but not many; and his own party proper, not large now, is certain to be further reduced, if not practically obliterated.

A certain number of Patrons will be elected, but the majority of Liberal Patrons will considerably exceed the number of Conservative Patrons. In the following constituencies there is in the field neither a Conservative candidate nor a candidate of Conservative sympathies, the contest being left to a Liberal and a Liberal Patron: North Brant, South Grey, East Huron, Prescott, East Hastings, East Kent, South Oxford, South Perth, South Wellington, South Waterloo.

Practically, Sir Oliver Mowat has already a start of some fourteen votes in the next Legislature; and as the tendency of unattached individual members is to gravitate towards the Government of the day, we believe it will be found on Tuesday evening next when the polls close that Sir Oliver Mowat will be practically greatly stronger in the coming Provincial Parliament than in that just dissolved.

In Questionable Taste.

Mr. Hume Elliot (son of Judge Wm. Elliot), as chairman of the sectarian exercises conducted in the drill shed last night by Mr. Meredith's legal friends, hardly manifested good taste or good judgment in twitting Mr. C. S. Hyman with being a bogus M. P., when he well knows that but for the act of Judge Elliot in setting at naught the decision of six superior court judges, and in counting many bogus votes in favor of Mr. Carling, London would be represented at Ottawa to-day by Mr. Hyman who received the majority of the votes of the legal electors.

THE PEOPLE'S FORUM.

The "Catholic Vote."

To the Editor of the ADVERTISER: W. R. Meredith says: "A powerful church is endeavoring to send the whole of its membership against me." This statement is both false and misleading. In the writer's opinion no church in Ontario has the power to send its members against Mr. Meredith without Mr. Meredith's own cooperation. In matters purely political it is quite natural for men to differ, and in that case the church could not unite her members if she would, and she would not unite them if she could.

Who, then, has crystallized the Catholic vote in Provincial politics? Was it the church? No; it was Mr. Meredith himself, when in the London Opera House he attacked his Catholic Conservative friends and said: "Unite, unite, against (them) the common enemy!" That speech has done Mr. Meredith more harm than the speech of any bishop, archbishop or ecclesiastic in the land.

If Mr. Meredith attacked the Methodists, or the Baptists, or the Presbyterians, or the Anglicans and called them "the common enemy," it would not be necessary for the churches to make any special efforts to "send" out their members to vote against him. They would go out and vote of their own accord. No man likes to kiss the hand that smites him, and so without any effort of "a powerful church," the members of that church who are attacked and charged with being "the common enemy," go of their own free will to the polls and there resent the insult heaped upon them by W. R. Meredith.

Sir Oliver Mowat never bestowed undue favor on any church, but most people prefer an honorable foe to an ungrateful friend, and for that reason Catholic Conservatives prefer Mowat to Meredith. So that if the Catholic vote in Provincial elections is a solid vote it was Mr. Meredith himself and not Dr. Cleary or the Catholic Church that made it so.

Mr. Meredith is making a serious mistake when he attacks the Catholic Church for the purpose of inducing Protestant Reformers to desert their party. Protestant Reformers are not easily humbugged, and so when the returns are all in next Tuesday night the "great" (?) leader and the statesman (?) W. R. Meredith will take one last fearful look at the Free Press bulletin, then amid sighs and sobs he can say to his followers: "Carry me away to a dismal swamp."

And bury me in a hole in the ground; Where the butter-flies butt and the bumble-bees hum And the straddle-bug straddle around." Yours, JAMES HARVEY. Middlesex, June 22, 1894.

—Look out for Roobachs. No charge that can be sustained is held until the last days of the campaign.

Grant's Retort.

Queen's Principal Scores the Toronto Candidate.

The Charge of Bribery Utterly Without Warrant

Why Sensible Canadians Should Keep Off Meredith's Political Toboggan Slide.

Centralization of Public Institutions Stoutly Resisted.

Mr. Hobbs' Opponent Charged With Riding Two Horses in Opposite Directions.

A Victory for Mr. Meredith's Indorsers Would be "Disastrous to National Peace and Prosperity."

KINGSTON, June 21.—Principal Grant, of Queen's University, has addressed the following open letter to Mr. W. R. Meredith:

KINGSTON, June 21, 1894. Dear Sir,—As you are to address a public meeting in Kingston on Saturday night, permit me, as one of the public, to ask you to speak plainly on two subjects that have been much discussed recently.

In the first place, is it not the case that according to our constitution while the initiation of money grants rests with the Government of the day, the responsibility for voting them is on the Legislature, and that, next to the leader of the Government, no one is so responsible as the leader of the Opposition? His business is to watch the Government, to oppose any new policy if it seems to him bad, and to expose and do his best to defeat proposals that are in any way contrary to the public interest.

When, therefore, in 1892 a vote for a mining school at Port Arthur, conditional on as much more being raised locally, passed the Legislature without opposition, men who had been agitating for a school of practical science for this part of the Province concluded that you were in favor of the policy, and that what had been done at the request of one municipality would be done on a larger scale at the non-partisan request of a score of cities, towns and counties on behalf of a school in Kingston. A public meeting was thereupon called in the council chamber here, and it was decided to ask the Government and Legislature to act along the lines which they themselves had thus laid down.

The Government acceded to the request and placed \$6,000 in the estimates of 1893 for the proposed school. You did not offer a word in opposition, and the member for the city publicly declared that Mr. Wood and Dr. Preston, Conservative members for Hastings and Leeds, as well as others, advocated it as strenuously as himself.

Now, my question is: Are you not more responsible for that grant than any one of the thousand of private citizens who asked for it, and were you not then called upon by honor to say so when the organs which support you asserted it to be a job, and in particular charged me with having

ACCEPTED IT AS A BRIBE?

I am sorry that it should be necessary to ask such a question. You should have spoken out manfully on the point without being catechised. I have waited until the latest possible moment before putting the question, but as you have kept silent on it for weeks, though referring to me again and again, it is necessary to put it formally. I do so, too, in your own interest. It matters nothing what is said concerning me by anonymous writers—"belated survivors of the scurrility of Grub Street, to use a recent expression of the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain—but it matters much that Mr. Meredith should not shield himself behind them or journalistic peck-niffs, and that the man who may be called upon to lead the Administration of this Province should show himself to be what his friends claim him to be—a gentleman.

One or two questions should be answered by you in connection with this. Is it part of your policy to abolish the grant? This question can be answered briefly: "yes" or "no" will be sufficient. The grant should be abolished if it was given as a bribe to a person, corporation or locality. It will be abolished if the Toronto papers that

support you are the exponents of your policy; for, according to them, the grant should have been given to the School of Practical Science in Toronto, though that institution has received, for buildings, equipment and maintenance, a quarter of a million dollars during the last few years, all without a word of criticism from you, though occasional criticism would not have been altogether misplaced. They object that the school in Kingston helps Queen's, and that argument is conclusive with them, just as, according to Macaulay, bear-baiting was excusable, not because it hurt the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. Both you and they favored the university federation, though one of the conditions was the giving a site to Victoria worth \$100,000, with the offer of the same to Queen's, and another of the conditions was that the Provincial University should accept as part of the course for a B. A. degree some of the examinations of more divinity schools. But seeing that Queen's, a self-governing and therefore undenominational and unpolitical university, declined to go to Toronto, nothing, according to them, must be done for Eastern Ontario, lest the university, which is doing much of the higher education of the Province, may be benefited indirectly. Is this what is meant when you declare for the complete separation of church and State? It could be called by very different names by the straightforward man who uses

"SABER CUTS OF SAXON SPEECH"

At any rate, a statesman should define his position on the subject when those who undertake to speak for him set him up as an advocate of centralization at the cost of common sense.

In the second place, may I ask you to state whether you are now conducting a campaign against certain rather insignificant amendments to the Separate School Act, which you did not vote against when proposed, or in initiating a campaign against separate schools themselves? It may be more difficult to answer this question with a single word, but all who are determined that Confederation shall not be "smashed," and especially who decline to place themselves on a

TOBOGGAN SLIDE IN POLITICS

until they see the end, must have it answered distinctly. It is vital to your own reputation and to those interests which must be dear to you to take a stand here which cannot be mistaken.

You seem to me to be giving an uncertain sound; but if I am mistaken in this you will forgive and at the same time thank me. I can excuse irritation at the attitude of Archbishop Cleary, though you must admit that it is Sir Oliver Mowat that ought to be irritated, and that you can afford to keep cool when not a man in the press or on the platform has taken the side of your rash clerical opponent. At any rate personal irritation is no excuse for dropping one principle and picking up the opposite. That is rather too great a compliment for a great party to pay to Dr. Cleary. In the past you took pleasure in pointing out that Canada owed separate schools to the Conservative party, but you now remark that "nothing more surely would tend to remove the bitterness undeniably existing between Protestants and Roman Catholics than common schools for all alike." The point I wish to make here

is not so much that you are wrong as that you are trying to

RIDE TWO PRETTY RESTIVE HORSES at the same moment. That you are wrong I am sure. The land to the south of us has the system you laud, yet it is the fruitful breeding ground of "Know Nothing" and "P. P. A." movements. Great Britain and Canada have it not, yet they breed no such misshapen things. The separate school system embedded in the Confederation is a safety valve, and an engine that has no safety valve is slightly defective.

When the Roman Catholics of Canada think that separate schools are unnecessary it will be time enough to abolish them. In the meantime all discussions along that line by statesmen is as the fall of sparks on the tinder. Nothing shows that you are wrong more than the fact that in the United States the Roman Catholics have as many parochial schools proportionately as they have separate schools in Canada. They have them, however, outside of the constitution, and thereby feel that they are crushed by a mere majority. Can you not respect the sentiment that makes the Roman Catholic give his money for parochial schools, even after having paid for a common school for the Protestant neighbors? It is the high sentiment that religion must have a place in every true system of education. You may say that his idea of religion is crude, but statesmen must take him as he is. To try and force different ideas on him is to force him to be free. Freedom must come from within, and not by external pressure. Still, the separate school is a mistake, and if the United States system would remove the bitterness existing between Protestants and Roman Catholics it is your plain duty to initiate a campaign for the abolition of the separate school. You have already given encouragement to your allies, who are determined to move in that direction. You may not wish to move as rapidly as they, but there is a logic in events that will force you. Your P. P. A. supporters know what they want, and if you are dependent upon their support you may pay the price that the men of one idea will insist upon. In that case

WOE TO OUR PROVINCE AND TO CANADA! When statesmen fancy that grave problems can be solved in Donnybrook fashion, farewell to our hopes of building up a British Canadian nation. My own position, sir, makes me hope that you will pardon me for asking for an explicit answer on this subject. In 1891 I was afraid that the Liberal party was getting on a toboggan slide that would land them in annexation or something worse and therefore, though I had never previously given Sir John Macdonald a vote, I accompanied him publicly to the platform in this city to show upon what platform I then stood. When he died I advocated, when asked my views, the calling of Sir Chas. Tupper to the Premiership, because he was the strongest man to fight what I thought an anti-Canadian and anti-British policy. In war, the ablest general must be put at the head of the army, irrespective of everything else. Now that the Liberal party has renounced commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity and proposed reciprocity of tariffs, I feel at ease, and am hoping that they will begin by offering to reciprocate with Britain. That can be done by our own motion, while reciprocity with the States can be done only when we control Washington. In one word,

I AM NOT A PARTY MAN.

I am simply a Canadian and I value highly the services of our best public men, no matter what their party may be. To me, therefore, it would be a public calamity to have a man like you get on a slide that would carry him into a warfare which he himself would detest. A party victory gained at such a price would be disastrous to the national peace and prosperity, and with all the earnestness of which I am capable, I appeal to independent men and more particularly to true Conservatives to pause before they decide that they can afford to dismiss Sir Oliver Mowat.

Yours sincerely, G. M. GRANT.

WILL COUNT THE BALLOTS.

The Deputy Returning Officers for the Polling Booths on Tuesday.

Following is a list of the deputy returning officers who will officiate in the respective subdivisions in Tuesday's elections:

Ward No. 1—Subdivision 1, Stephen Grant; 2, B. C. McCann; 3, Dr. W. J. Loe; 4, Thos. Moffatt; 5, J. B. Smythe; 6, W. Stevens; 7, John Talbot.

Ward No. 2—No. 1, J. R. Milne; 2, Andrew Greenlees; 3, O. Baynes; 4, John Smith; 5, Alex. Tytler; 6, P. F. Boyle.

Ward No. 3—No. 1, James Pirie; 2, H. R. Thorne; 3, W. Clarke; 4, Frederick McVean; 5, James Adams; 6, Thomas A. Brown; 7, R. H. Gildert.

Ward No. 4—No. 1, W. S. Rhyard; 2, E. Fitzgerald; 3, W. Lind; 4, J. Lucas; 5, T. H. Luscombe; 6, John Isaac.

Ward No. 5—No. 1, W. H. Gould; 2, Harry Warren; 3, A. Isaac; 3b, G. F. Robertson; 4, J. Sanders; 5, C. G. Stapleton.

Ward No. 6—No. 1, W. F. Howell; 2, W. A. Westland; 3, J. G. Pritchett; 4, J. Thorburn; 5, George Fennings.

Reserve a time to sit for your photos on Dominion Day at WESTLAKE'S, Phone, 571.

ATTEND

KINGSMILL'S

GREAT SALE.

TWO STOCKS IN ONE.

The residue of the Spittal, Burn & Gentleman stock is now removed to our own premises, and will be offered at the same Bankrupt prices, together with our own regular stock, aggregating over two hundred thousand dollars. We have been busy day and night all week getting ready and reducing prices. We have fixed everything your way. Come and take advantage of it.

KINGSMILL'S

THE

RELIABLE STORE

Dundas and Carling Streets.

LONDON, - - ONTARIO.