HISTORY OF THE MAIL

WHAT SWELLED HEAD BROUGHT A NEWSPAPER TO.

Record of the Organ, Past and Present—How It Became What It Is—Treachery, Deceit and Ingratitude First, Last and All the Time.

CHAP. I.

Years ago three boys ran about the streets of Toronto—barefooted boys, full of life and the abundance of animal spirits:

In that first budding spring of youth
When all its prospects please.

They were like ordinary Toronto boys of poor parentage, they did not wear shoes in warm weather, their summer straw hats were constructed with due regard to the latest improved system of ventilation, their clothes were not as fair in the front parlor, and they abhorred, derided, played tricks upon and feared in a general way the policeman on his beat. They were good enough boys, stout, hardy fellows, with wits sharpened day by day in contact with the sharp edges of the human world, with ideas commensurate with the people they met, with aspirations that ranged high as the best people in the land they from the sidewalk saw driving by. They were as other boys of the town, who had good parents and unlimited freedom, sharper perhaps than the ordinary run, bosses even at early age of the boys in the ward, never known to get the worst of it in a dicker, and always or mostly always on top in the troubles incident to boyhood in the city. Two of them were Irish, one at least born in Ireland, and one was Scotch, but even as boys they were Canadians.

CHAP. II.

The boys grew to manhood. All received good business educations. The Scotch boy with a natural aptitude for finance entered a bank, rose steadily in his profession, and is now the leading figure in one of the most extensive and soundest financial institutions in Toronto, Canada, or America for that matter—a man universally respected, and enjoying among the newspaper devotees the reputation of being the hardest man to interview in the province. With him we have no further concern.

One of the boys, the younger of the two Irish descendants, went into The Globe office as printer's devil, learned the trade thoroughly in that and other composing rooms, was foreman of The Globe office under the late Hon. George Brown, left printing to enter commercial life, sold codfish and wet groceries, entered into a partnership, became bankrupt, knocked around a bit and ultimately went into the sugar business at Niagara Falls.

The other of the three made a reputation as a business man, started with his brother into the manufacture of paper at Merritton, went on the road, sold goods right and left, accumulated wealth, went into other branches of business and mining, grew rich and became ambitious.

CHAP. III.

Sixteen years ago the Conservatives of Ontario, under the leadership of Sir John Macdonald, started a daily paper in Toronto to advocate the views of their party, subscribed liberally, employed good men, and produced, for the times, a good paper. The third of the three boys sold them the paper, gave any amount of credit, let them run into debt to the extent of $33,000, was the friend of all parties, obtained a chattle mortgage as security on the understanding that six months' notice was to be given before a foreclosure, neatly dodged this safeguard, and on the eve of a general election in the face of one of the bitterest political fights that ever convulsed the Dominion, when it would have been party madness to have sunk into court, closed his grip, threw overboard the management then in power, introduced the sugar-dealer boy as general manager, and obtained for a song a property worth a quarter of a million.

The new management went in and supported the Conservative party for a time, but again on the eve of an election, when defection appeared to be greater, when a traitor could do his worst, consummated the blackest act of political atrocity that has ever disgraced the annals of Canadian history, turned on the men who had established and built up its history, and was only saved from rending the hand that reared it by the inherent contempt Canadians have for treachery, deceit and ingratitude.

The first boy mentioned, the banker, we have no present concern with. The second was Christopher W. Bunting, the third was John Riordan and his brother was Charles Riordan, and the paper referred to was The Mail.

The rise, decline and fall of that paper is a part of Canadian newspaperdom.

Origin of The Mail.

The Mail originated, if the term may be allowed, on March 30, 1871. Fifty Ontario Conservatives, headed by Sir John Macdonald, put down $1000 each, and the capital stock was fixed at $100,000, only two-thirds of which, however, was ever paid up. Mr. T. C. Patteson was the manager, and with him were associated, either then or later, such men as Josiah Blackburn (the present manager of The London Free Press), Charley Belford, George Kingsmill, Edward Farrer, and other well known writers. For years it was issued in the old blanket sheet four-page style, but nevertheless it was a good paper, a consistent loyal journal, devoted to its friends, its party and the news of the day. In its salutatory it said, and the words would blister the tongue of the present management:

The Mail will not write up any man or any project to gratify any personal or interested motives. The rigid impersonality which will characterize the opinions and utterances of The Mail will prevent the damaging suspicion that selfish purposes are ever being served under a thin disguise of anonymous opposition or support.

No one knows better than the present management of The Mail how utterly impossible it is for that journal to-day to truthfully make the above statement.

Well, time went on and in the fall of 1877, by trickery, the Riordans obtained control of the paper, establishing Bunting, The Globe job printer, as manager, and because it was on the eve of the elections of 1878 held their own. But the scheme born in iniquity could not mature in rectitude or decency, and the heads swollen with the success freely given by Conservatives all over the country were not able to stand success.

Old John Riordan went away to England and died; why he went, and how he died let The Mail people tell—he died. But the man who had planned and consummated the first deal had long before been supplanted in power by the tools he had used for the purpose, and his death made no change in Pulptower. It was scarcely even noticed.

The end went on. Pulptower rose and Pulptower heads swelled. The heads got so large that they wanted to run the party. Demands were made that were repulsed with the throat on the eve of an election had secured to the Riordan interest for $33,000 a property worth $250,000. Again in 1886 the party was taken by the throat. But this time it was a matter of public policy and not private interest, and the swelled heads for reply were battered against the wall. The thing had been working for some time. It had been working from the time that Bunting had entered into the unholy bribery conspiracy to overthrow the Ontario Government, and from the time the Riordans had demanded to have a senatorship in the family.

The Fall of The Mail.

This time it worked backwards. Repudiated by the leaders of the party, contemned by the followers, scorned by its own supporters, The Mail threw to the winds every principle of justice and fair dealing it had ever professed, and entered upon a campaign of appeals to race and creed and sectional prejudices in the mild hope of once more regaining a foothold of power. The result everybody knows. The rout of its candidates in the Ontario elections last December tells the story. Then like a scorpion The Mail turned and bit itself, abandoned the last vestige of consistency to the principles it had professed during sixteen years, and marched out into the world with the smutch of political leprosy upon it, warning all men to keep away. Even that would not do, and driven to death to find a reason for existence it is now trying to cut in between The Globe and its Reform following—with but indifferent success it is true—while a hypocritical advocacy of prohibition, which the private lives of the managers do not sustain, is counted upon to rehabilitate that journalistic respectability which crookedness in politics had effectually destroyed.

Old John Riordan is dead. His brother Charles reigns in his stead. Charles Riordan and the estate of his dead brother are the principal proprietors of The Mail. Mr. Bunting has a fair interest and is a brother-in-law. Mr. Douglas, the secretary-treasurer, also in the family, has a fair interest. Four employes—Messrs. Dyas, Darby, Hambly and Matthews, have had presents of a little stock but no other interest. The Riordans are supreme.

Above it was said that the last vestige of principle and consistency was thrown to the winds by The Mail after the provincial elections. It shall be our duty to-day to show how true this is, how sharp the turn has been, what recklessness has characterized the paper's course, how little it is to be depended upon, and what kind of people the Riordans are.

On British Connection.

There have in the past sixteen years been several important questions before the Canadian public, on which The Mail has spoken with no uncertain sound. A few extracts, picked up at random, we show in each case to prove what The Mail was and what it is. Take first the question of loyalty to the Mother Country. The Mail's attitude on this question is well known of late years—the leader of the loyal movement, but see what it was from the very beginning. On April 1, 1872, the second issue of the paper, there was the following sentiment:

The Party which advocates Canadian interests, which is bent on making Canada a mighty integral part of the British Empire, able to stand by itself when necessity requires, which works to consolidate the elements of Confederation into one powerful and prosperous united people, is the Party which Ontario will support—and that Party is the Party which consummated Confederation, and which for five years has been industriously finishing that noble monument of sound statesmanship and Canadian wisdom.

And lest this might be looked on as an April fool joke, the paper the following day said to show its faith in both England and Canada:

Whether regarded in a political, material or social aspect, Confederation brought about results of the highest importance. . . . But above everything else, the value of the union lies in the strength it gains. . . . While we are still warranted to hope for aid from England when really needed, let us cherish the conviction that a free people, united and resolute, in defence of its homes and its liberties, is invincible.

While on April 30 it hurled at its opponents the following:

The Grits are furious with Great Britain for not pressing on the United States our Fenian raid claims. The British government withdrew these claims for the good reason that, by urging them, they would render Great Britain liable for the enormous bill of consequential damages to which the new objects, and which the American Government will no doubt withdraw. Canada would have gained $2,000,000 by the pressing of Fenian claims; England would have had to foot the "consequential" bill of $200,000,000. Our gain would have been one-hundred fold her loss; and yet the Grits, whose hearts bleed for the heavily-taxed English people, deride the "helpless old land," for "cringing in abject fear before our rapacious neighbors." The loyalty of a party that can be purchased for $2,000,000 must be exceedingly weak in the back and heavily diluted with treason.

Coming down then to a later date, we find on July 18, 1878, the following:

We have never claimed all the loyalty of Canada for the Conservative Party; we know here are many thoroughly loyal men in the Reform ranks. But we do not hesitate to say that all the disloyal men are in the Grit party; and that it is required the strong bulwark of Conservative immovability in its devotion to the Mother Country to secure the firm connection which exists to-day. . . . They are all very good fair weather sailors. But they are not to be trusted in a storm. Their hearts do not lovingly throb with love for Britain; they take no delight in the glorious traditions of the greatest nation in the world; except to save their own necks and their own purses they would not raise a finger to prevent her time-honored banner being trailed in the dust.

As to the sentiments of the paper on this subject in 1882, and down to last year they are too well known to need recapitulation. But take The Mail of to-day with its easy assurance in proposing to hand over the country to the Yankees, remember that the only cause of change is the envious hearts and burked purposes of the owners of the paper, and an idea can be formed of what gross inconsistency means.

C. U. and Annexation.

In no way has The Mail more clearly shown its utter inconsistency and unreliability than by adopting the commercial union fad and advocating what no man on its staff has a particle of faith in. Let us trace the evolution of the commercial union theory from The Mail mind—for it is an interesting study. In 1872 The Mail was opposed even to independence for Canada for fear of annexation tendencies, as witness the following which appeared on April 19 of that year:

We do not say, as has on some occasions been said, that the Canadian advocates of independence are really annexationists in disguise; though there may be a few Mail writers sheep in the little flock. But we think no one who thoughtfully considers the question can doubt that, in our present partially developed state, independence would ultimately lead to annexation. This is unquestionably the view of the best thinkers of the country. The possibility of such a result is of itself a sufficient reason why we should cherish the happy connection which we have so long enjoyed rather than follow prattling visionaries along the doubtful paths of conjecture and disturbance.

On July 15 of that year, 1872, came a declaration on the subject which alone is sufficient to condemn the present course of The Mail in the eyes of every unprejudiced man. Read it carefully:

When men work together in Opposition there is a tacit understanding between them that they will share power when they obtain it. The allies in war mutually participate in the success of their arms, so co-workers on a political platform divide amongst themselves the honor and responsibility of the Government of the country when the voice of the people has pronounced in their favor. The Grits have allies. The Antis, the Annexationists and the Parti Nationale could not give Mr. Mackenzie a consistent support if they did not expect, and have good reasons for expecting, that he will tangibly recognize them when he takes the place of Sir John Macdonald. It follows inevitably, therefore, that a Grit Administration must contain representatives of the Government allies. The Parti Nationale would exercise a powerful influence in a Grit Cabinet representing, as it does, the Anti-Macdonald-Cartier element of Quebec. What is this Parti? It rose from the remnants of the shattered Rouge faction. Four-fifths of its members are known to favor annexation; and the main principle of the organization, the policy they banded together to carry is to provide, *that this country shall have power to adopt commercial treaties without any reference to Imperial interests; and to enforce a tariff that will admit American manufactures free into Canada and put a heavy duty on English goods.* The blind can see that such a policy is utterly incompatible with British connection. It is a proclamation in favor of annexation issued under cover of a mock anxiety for the national welfare. It is a cunning attempt to obtain under false pretences the support of the people on behalf of separation from Great Britain. Driven by the prospect of defeat to adopt any course however desperate, to embrace any companions however politically debauched, to support any policy however detestable to loyal men, etc. . . . Electors, stand by the men who, for five years, have served you and the Empire to the incalculable benefit of both. Confound by your votes the machinations of those who seek to betray this young and prosperous country; and by a sweeping victory for the party of Union and Progress over the Ontario allies of the disloyalists, let the world know that Canada is bound to her sanctified allegiance, true to herself, and confident in a glorious future. That is the only course which a Canadian patriot can pursue.

The Italics are The Mail's. Could anything be more apt to the present time? Then see how the paper answers itself on its present claim that the farmers only hope is to get into the American market:

July 2, 1878: They (the Mackenzie Government) had relied on the farming vote. Themselves innately purchasable, they never questioned that two cents saved on factory cotton would buy every farmer from Halifax to Vancouver. "Patriotism," said they, "love of country—pshaw! What do farmers care if every town is burnt? Show 'em a dollar, and you'll fetch 'em." It was a slight mistake and those who knew themselves so well are beginning to find that they by no means know the farmers. . . . However odd it may appear, it seems that farmers have more patriotism than likes the destruction of Canadian cities, and more humanity than is pleased with the misery of their inhabitants. Our townsmen who still remain have little money to buy farm produce; on the other hand the States send in what we produce they choose. Between the two the great majority of our farmers get poor prices or no prices, for cattle, butter, cheese, pork, oats, wheat and many other articles. They remark: "When our towns were prosperous we could sell all these things well. Now we lose on poor sales 'en times over what we gain on cheap goods. Besides, why not have cheap goods and factories too? We observe that we get the cheapest goods from the most highly protected country in the world, etc."

July 25, 1878: If we want to have goods cheap, if we want to develop our resources, if we have faith in our country we must adopt a "National Policy." This is seen by the people and by none more clearly than by the Canadian farmers.

Then too, The Mail saw clearly that the help for Canada was in Canada helping herself, and that only national disaster could ensue from rushing into the arms of Americans, as witness the following examples:

July 1, 1878: The determination of our neighbors never to return to reciprocity is established, and the result of the present jug-handled system is seen in the history of the past three years. But of course when the cloud left behind by the great conflict is wholly dispersed we should become still more helpless in competition with our neighbors, and as the late American Consul here foresaw, pass entirely under their control. Whether Dominion Day ten years hence shall be one of rejoicing, whether we shall then look back on ten years of progress in wealth and population and power, or whether Canadians shall "creep, crawling and crab-like," through a ruined country, impoverished by ignorance and folly, depends on the verdict which the country will give at the coming elections (in favor of protection against the Americans).

Aug. 7, 1878: Give Canada to Canadians and England will not suffer by it, but on the contrary both will be largely benefited. . . . There is a species of semi-barbarity in bowie-knifing one's own country's opportunities.

Aug. 21, 1878: (1) A nation that would be prosperous must prosecute various branches of industry, and supply its vital wants mainly by the labor of its own hands.

(2) There is a natural tendency in a comparatively new country to become and continue an exporter of grain and other rude staples, and an importer of manufactures.

(3) It is injurious to the new country thus to continue dependent for its supplies of clothing and manufactured fabrics on the old.

(4) That equilibrium between agriculture, manufacture and commerce which we need can only be maintained by means of protective duties.

(5) Protection is necessary and proper to sustain as well as to create a beneficent adjustment of our national industries.

But time went on and in 1882 there was another appeal to the people. The Mail had observed the working of protection for several years and was perfectly satisfied. Among the mass of its declarations on the subject at that time we take but two as samples of all. These we refer especially to the farmers, because it is at the farmers a dead break is now being made. On June 5, 1882, among twenty-one reasons given for voting against Mr. Blake appeared the following:

Because the motto of the party is "Canada for the Americans." He and they would deprive the farmer of his home market, and render it certain that with good harvests in Europe the country would be flooded with American produce. They would make this country once more a slaughter market, etc.

A return to so-called free trade under which our manufacturers went down in the struggle with American grain would prove ruinous to our agricultural classes.

Time went on and along about 1885, commercial union began to be discussed. It propped up first in the Maritime Provinces, and on Oct. 30 of that year The Mail expressed its opinions of its advocates in the following language:

By the way a convention of the various elements of the Anti-Opposition would be a curiosity. Old Reformers, Young Liberals, Commercial Unionists, Independence men, Annexationists, queer assortment of bed fellows it may seem, but it is not the people decline to be governed by such a conglomeration of factions!

Last year the talk went on, and The Mail was utterly opposed to the scheme. We know perfectly well what it advocated it would lead to annexation and said, on Jan. 29, in the following vigorous words:

Commercial union with the States would undoubtedly lead to the severance of British connection. . . . Commercial union would weaken the barrier between us and the Americans by removing what may be described as the resistance offered by Canada to the proposal to unite with England; and that the barrier would ultimately be broken down altogether is as certain as the operation of the law of gravitation. Commercial union enables large bodies to attract smaller ones.

Later on, on July 29, 1886, it was equally certain about the ultimate result, as witness:

The "well known Liberal" also said that if the Liberal party were once in power they would make the United States Congress to establish free trade between the United States and Canada, with a heavy tariff against Great Britain. Canada would become annexed to the United States without a doubt, notwithstanding the loyal feeling she holds for England. . . . We now is to get into first aim of the Liberal programme, and power at Ottawa. Once there they flatter themselves they will be "strong enough" to persuade the United States to establish free trade. The man who thinks a step the "well known Liberal" has told us.

While as late as Aug. 21, just about a year ago, it condemned commercial union as annexation in disguise, as it had done from 1872 down, by saying:

But this much is certain, Mr. Langley thinks, commercial union will help the annexation movement. Free trade with the United States and a strong tariff against other countries England for example—will, in his mind, lessen the difficulties in the way of floating the Stars and Stripes over the Dominion. He, therefore, favors commercial union. It is well to know what these Reform statesmen in the east really mean.

Then came a squarrel with the party. Sir John Macdonald refused Bunting's and Riordan's demands and remained firmest then on the platform at Ottawa. Nothing changed but the proprietors of The Mail, Principles and conditions remained as before, nothing was lost, everybody remained at peace, yet a few months later, on Feb. 15 of this year, The Mail next spoke on the subject of commercial union. It was in advocacy of that measure it had for sixteen years denounced and derided as disloyal and impractical. So far had it gone that it could already look upon the killing out of the industries of Canada with equanimity, if such should be the result. The entire Chamberlain's bill would throw down the customs barrier altogether and establish absolute free trade. This would be a statesmanlike way of settling the perennial fisheries question, and one, we think, which would meet with the approval of the vast majority of Canadians. Without doubt many industries that the United States would result in the weeding out of some of the industries which the tariff of 1879 called into existence, etc.

In order that there might be no misunderstanding on the subject of how little is cared for Canadian industries The Mail the next day, Feb. 16, said:

There would be an outcry from those Canadian manufacturers whose sucking industries would succumb to American competition.

While, as to its utter disregard for that British connection which it had so often praised, it on the same day said:

We would have to maintain our duties on British manufactures whilst admitting American goods free, and this might or might not strain our relations with the Mother Country.

. . . In plain English, the connection might be endangered.

Of its course since on this question there is no need to speak, but let any person, the manager of The Mail included, read once the extracts above given, but a few selected from hundreds, remember that the change is the outcome of private spleen and swelled head, and then say upon what grounds she present stand of the paper is either honest, decent or justifiable.

Regarding the French Canadians.

Take now The Mail's course regarding the unity of Confederation and its treatment of French Canadians. But one or two extracts will be given, sufficient, however, to show the turn that has been taken. On July 2, 1872, The Mail said editorially:

All other means of defeating the Government having failed, the Grit organ-in-chief has resorted to a shameless and desperate conspiracy. It has returned to the vomit of its past record, and is now intent on pitting section against section and setting Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion. . . . Sectional means and sectional purposes are the inevitable forerunners of anarchy. . . . If we conspire against our sister provinces they can conspire against us and the result must be mutual death. . . . The strength of Canada lies in the mutual fellowship of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia.

On July 4 of the same year the following broad principle was laid down:

The French have as much right to control their province as the English-speaking people have to control Ontario. In the National Legislature we are in the ascendancy by thirty votes—one-sixth of the House. Ontario has no right whatever to arrogate to herself supreme power over Quebec or any other part of the Dominion. With equal justice the French press might harp on English domination. That the Dominion Government has acted uprightly towards all creeds and nationalities is evidenced by the fact that the spirit of religious intolerance assiduously nurtured by Mr. George Brown is extinct. Nor is the accident of his birth either a recommendation or an impediment to the meanest inhabitant of Canada.

Later on The Mail in wrath declaimed:

The Grit organ in this city yesterday resumed the tactics that disgraced it in the past, in endeavoring to set Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion. Against this villainous policy we appeal to every patriot in the country. Was not Confederation carried as the only means of averting civil war and keeping Upper and Lower Canada from cutting each other's throats? For the sake of building up the fallen fortunes of a Faction are we to return to the lamentable days of 1863? Electors of Ontario! If you value the new order of things inaugurated by Confederation set your faces against this unholy attempt to promote sectional hatred. If you value unity among the provinces, be not led away by the harangues of this breeder of quarrels. If you desire that your present prosperity should continue, do not destroy it by creating discord among your countrymen. If you love Canada take care that you do not assist in rending her asunder. . . . Desperate indeed must be the cause that needs national discord to support it; and utterly bereft of principle must be the men who would have this province accomplish the ruin of the whole country that they may be temporarily benefited. It is truly fit and proper that their allies in Quebec are traitors; in New Brunswick, traitors; in Nova Scotia, traitors—bleds of a feather with a common aim, companions in an united effort to subvert the constitution for their individual gain, ranked together to combat Union and Progress.

This attitude was kept up for years and as late as Nov. 20, 1885, The Mail said:

The Mail has been the friend of the French-Canadian people through good and evil report, because it has learned to admire their many sterling qualities, among which sound common sense has always shone pre-eminent.

Then came the great break, and three days later, in the famous article on "A Grave Crisis," the paper which had just praised the common sense of the French Canadians said:

Hitherto the French race in Canada has been fairly treated. . . . Yet after efforts to establish amicable relations with them, even at the sacrifice of prosperity, the French Canadians are now seeking to compel us to recognize their right to suspend the operations of the law whenever a representative of their church feels it to be his interest to do so. But let us solemnly assure them again that, rather than submit to such a yoke, Ontario would smash Confederation into its original fragments, preferring that the dream of a united Canada should be shattered forever, than that unity should be purchased at the expense of equality.

While on the 30th of the month it referred to the deliverance of Quebec and the Dominion into the hands of French Canadian nationalism and intolerance. Its continued attacks upon these people are well known to everybody.

The Catholic Crusade.

This leads one naturally to a contemplation of The Mail's course regarding the Roman Catholic population of Canada, one of the outcomes of spite against Sir John Macdonald. How the paper used to rage at The Globe, and who does not remember its warning to the Catholic League, in April, 1872. Perhaps some do not; here is it:

Some months ago a league was formed in this city with the avowed object of bringing the Catholics of Ontario to their political knees. . . . Its ostensible object was to combat. Unity hurts no race or religion; least of all Irish Catholics, whose influence in Canada and Ireland has always been weakened by dissension, petty jealousies and defection. The program of the league was a good one. The political elevation of a compact voting one-fifth the population of Ontario was a wholesome and patriotic ambition.

Proceeding, The Mail warns its Catholic friends not to make their league a tool in the hands of the Grits, as some seemed disposed to do, and said:

We need not tell our Catholic friends that their union with Ontario Grits would be a spectacle as unnatural as the fellowship of the lamb and hyena or the feeding of Sarah and Grover well. . . . For a quarter of a century they received from the chief of that party more villainous denunciation and abuse than from any other hands the heads of their forefathers in the darkest days of Irish history. Wherever they were sensitive he struck them. Matters they held most sacred he traversed. Doctrines they dearly cherished he derided. Their church, priests, religion, country, race—everything and all things Irish Catholic he traversed and decried with the most bigoted venom: he painted them as social out-throats. If they are harassed by ignominious laws, he responsible, he is the man who up as idolaters and Ishmaelites, against whom every Canadian's hand should be lifted. The very obstacles which the Catholic clergy have had to combat were the result of his life-long persecutions. Insufficient parliamentary representation, a lack of official positions and public employment, commensurate with their numbers—these are the grievances to redress which many of the Catholics joined the league, and they are the inevitable effects of his bigotry and intolerance.

. . . We might multiply instances, but we have quoted enough to show that an Irish Catholic is never selected by a Grit convention if any other eligible white man in the province is procurable. Occasionally they pitch upon a Catholic Tory to run in a county where Grit defeat is foreordained. They throw Irish Catholic candidates into the breach of political defeat as they throw cattle or enforced troops into the breach of inevitable death. Where success is even probable no Catholic, however capable, is selected; where success is certain no Catholic is ever thought of. Could never will be, an instance of the choice of a Catholic candidate by a Grit convention. The spirit that prompted their quarter-of-a-century of vituperation of the Catholic clergy, their vituperation of the Stars and Stripes over the Dominion. He, therefore, favors commercial union. It is well to know what these Reform statesmen in the east really mean.

Then came a squarrel with the party. Sir John Macdonald refused Bunting's and Riordan's demands and remained firmest then on the platform at Ottawa. Nothing changed but the proprietors of The Mail, Principles and conditions remained as before, nothing was lost, everybody remained at peace, yet a few months later, on Feb. 15 of this year, The Mail next spoke on the subject of commercial union. It was in advocacy of that measure it had for sixteen years denounced and derided as disloyal and impractical. So far had it gone that it could already look upon the killing out of the industries of Canada with equanimity, if such should be the result. The entire Chamberlain's bill would throw down the customs barrier altogether and establish absolute free trade. This would be a statesmanlike way of settling the perennial fisheries question, and one, we think, which would meet with the approval of the vast majority of Canadians. Without doubt many industries that the United States would result in the weeding out of some of the industries which the tariff of 1879 called into existence, etc.

In order that there might be no misunderstanding on the subject of how little is cared for Canadian industries The Mail the next day, Feb. 16, said:

There would be an outcry from those Canadian manufacturers whose sucking industries would succumb to American competition.

While, as to its utter disregard for that British connection which it had so often praised, it on the same day said:

We would have to maintain our duties on British manufactures whilst admitting American goods free, and this might or might not strain our relations with the Mother Country.

. . . In plain English, the connection might be endangered.

Of its course since on this question there is no need to speak, but let any person, the manager of The Mail included, read once the extracts above given, but a few selected from hundreds, remember that the change is the outcome of private spleen and swelled head, and then say upon what grounds she present stand of the paper is either honest, decent or justifiable.

Regarding the French Canadians.

Take now The Mail's course regarding the unity of Confederation and its treatment of French Canadians. But one or two extracts will be given, sufficient, however, to show the turn that has been taken. On July 2, 1872, The Mail said editorially:

All other means of defeating the Government having failed, the Grit organ-in-chief has resorted to a shameless and desperate conspiracy. It has returned to the vomit of its past record, and is now intent on pitting section against section and setting Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion. . . . Sectional means and sectional purposes are the inevitable forerunners of anarchy. . . . If we conspire against our sister provinces they can conspire against us and the result must be mutual death. . . . The strength of Canada lies in the mutual fellowship of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia.

On July 4 of the same year the following broad principle was laid down:

The French have as much right to control their province as the English-speaking people have to control Ontario. In the National Legislature we are in the ascendancy by thirty votes—one-sixth of the House. Ontario has no right whatever to arrogate to herself supreme power over Quebec or any other part of the Dominion. With equal justice the French press might harp on English domination. That the Dominion Government has acted uprightly towards all creeds and nationalities is evidenced by the fact that the spirit of religious intolerance assiduously nurtured by Mr. George Brown is extinct. Nor is the accident of his birth either a recommendation or an impediment to the meanest inhabitant of Canada.

Later on The Mail in wrath declaimed:

The Grit organ in this city yesterday resumed the tactics that disgraced it in the past, in endeavoring to set Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion. Against this villainous policy we appeal to every patriot in the country. Was not Confederation carried as the only means of averting civil war and keeping Upper and Lower Canada from cutting each other's throats? For the sake of building up the fallen fortunes of a Faction are we to return to the lamentable days of 1863? Electors of Ontario! If you value the new order of things inaugurated by Confederation set your faces against this unholy attempt to promote sectional hatred. If you value unity among the provinces, be not led away by the harangues of this breeder of quarrels. If you desire that your present prosperity should continue, do not destroy it by creating discord among your countrymen. If you love Canada take care that you do not assist in rending her asunder. . . . Desperate indeed must be the cause that needs national discord to support it; and utterly bereft of principle must be the men who would have this province accomplish the ruin of the whole country that they may be temporarily benefited. It is truly fit and proper that their allies in Quebec are traitors; in New Brunswick, traitors; in Nova Scotia, traitors—bleds of a feather with a common aim, companions in an united effort to subvert the constitution for their individual gain, ranked together to combat Union and Progress.

This attitude was kept up for years and as late as Nov. 20, 1885, The Mail said:

The Mail has been the friend of the French-Canadian people through good and evil report, because it has learned to admire their many sterling qualities, among which sound common sense has always shone pre-eminent.

Then came the great break, and three days later, in the famous article on "A Grave Crisis," the paper which had just praised the common sense of the French Canadians said:

Hitherto the French race in Canada has been fairly treated. . . . Yet after efforts to establish amicable relations with them, even at the sacrifice of prosperity, the French Canadians are now seeking to compel us to recognize their right to suspend the operations of the law whenever a representative of their church feels it to be his interest to do so. But let us solemnly assure them again that, rather than submit to such a yoke, Ontario would smash Confederation into its original fragments, preferring that the dream of a united Canada should be shattered forever, than that unity should be purchased at the expense of equality.

While on the 30th of the month it referred to the deliverance of Quebec and the Dominion into the hands of French Canadian nationalism and intolerance. Its continued attacks upon these people are well known to everybody.

The Catholic Crusade.

This leads one naturally to a contemplation of The Mail's course regarding the Roman Catholic population of Canada, one of the outcomes of spite against Sir John Macdonald. How the paper used to rage at The Globe, and who does not remember its warning to the Catholic League, in April, 1872. Perhaps some do not; here is it:

Some months ago a league was formed in this city with the avowed object of bringing the Catholics of Ontario to their political knees. . . . Its ostensible object was to combat. Unity hurts no race or religion; least of all Irish Catholics, whose influence in Canada and Ireland has always been weakened by dissension, petty jealousies and defection. The program of the league was a good one. The political elevation of a compact voting one-fifth the population of Ontario was a wholesome and patriotic ambition.

Proceeding, The Mail warns its Catholic friends not to make their league a tool in the hands of the Grits, as some seemed disposed to do, and said:

We need not tell our Catholic friends that their union with Ontario Grits would be a spectacle as unnatural as the fellowship of the lamb and hyena or the feeding of Sarah and Grover well. . . . For a quarter of a century they received from the chief of that party more villainous denunciation and abuse than from any other hands the heads of their forefathers in the darkest days of Irish history. Wherever they were sensitive he struck them. Matters they held most sacred he traversed. Doctrines they dearly cherished he derided. Their church, priests, religion, country, race—everything and all things Irish Catholic he traversed and decried with the most bigoted venom: he painted them as social out-throats. If they are harassed by ignominious laws, he responsible, he is the man who up as idolaters and Ishmaelites, against whom every Canadian's hand should be lifted. The very obstacles which the Catholic clergy have had to combat were the result of his life-long persecutions. Insufficient parliamentary representation, a lack of official positions and public employment, commensurate with their numbers—these are the grievances to redress which many of the Catholics joined the league, and they are the inevitable effects of his bigotry and intolerance.

. . . We might multiply instances, but we have quoted enough to show that an Irish Catholic is never selected by a Grit convention if any other eligible white man in the province is procurable. Occasionally they pitch upon a Catholic Tory to run in a county where Grit defeat is foreordained. They throw Irish Catholic candidates into the breach of political defeat as they throw cattle or enforced troops into the breach of inevitable death. Where success is even probable no Catholic, however capable, is selected; where success is certain no Catholic is ever thought of. Could never will be, an instance of the choice of a Catholic candidate by a Grit convention. The spirit that prompted their quarter-of-a-century of vituperation of the Catholic clergy, their vituperation of the Stars and Stripes over the Dominion. He, therefore, favors commercial union. It is well to know what these Reform statesmen in the east really mean.

Then came a squarrel with the party. Sir John Macdonald refused Bunting's and Riordan's demands and remained firmest then on the platform at Ottawa. Nothing changed but the proprietors of The Mail, Principles and conditions remained as before, nothing was lost, everybody remained at peace, yet a few months later, on Feb. 15 of this year, The Mail next spoke on the subject of commercial union. It was in advocacy of that measure it had for sixteen years denounced and derided as disloyal and impractical. So far had it gone that it could already look upon the killing out of the industries of Canada with equanimity, if such should be the result. The entire Chamberlain's bill would throw down the customs barrier altogether and establish absolute free trade. This would be a statesmanlike way of settling the perennial fisheries question, and one, we think, which would meet with the approval of the vast majority of Canadians. Without doubt many industries that the United States would result in the weeding out of some of the industries which the tariff of 1879 called into existence, etc.

In order that there might be no misunderstanding on the subject of how little is cared for Canadian industries The Mail the next day, Feb. 16, said:

There would be an outcry from those Canadian manufacturers whose sucking industries would succumb to American competition.

While, as to its utter disregard for that British connection which it had so often praised, it on the same day said:

We would have to maintain our duties on British manufactures whilst admitting American goods free, and this might or might not strain our relations with the Mother Country.

. . . In plain English, the connection might be endangered.

Of its course since on this question there is no need to speak, but let any person, the manager of The Mail included, read once the extracts above given, but a few selected from hundreds, remember that the change is the outcome of private spleen and swelled head, and then say upon what grounds she present stand of the paper is either honest, decent or justifiable.

Regarding the French Canadians.

Take now The Mail's course regarding the unity of Confederation and its treatment of French Canadians. But one or two extracts will be given, sufficient, however, to show the turn that has been taken. On July 2, 1872, The Mail said editorially:

All other means of defeating the Government having failed, the Grit organ-in-chief has resorted to a shameless and desperate conspiracy. It has returned to the vomit of its past record, and is now intent on pitting section against section and setting Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion. . . . Sectional means and sectional purposes are the inevitable forerunners of anarchy. . . . If we conspire against our sister provinces they can conspire against us and the result must be mutual death. . . . The strength of Canada lies in the mutual fellowship of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia.

On July 4 of the same year the following broad principle was laid down:

The French have as much right to control their province as the English-speaking people have to control Ontario. In the National Legislature we are in the ascendancy by thirty votes—one-sixth of the House. Ontario has no right whatever to arrogate to herself supreme power over Quebec or any other part of the Dominion. With equal justice the French press might harp on English domination. That the Dominion Government has acted uprightly towards all creeds and nationalities is evidenced by the fact that the spirit of religious intolerance assiduously nurtured by Mr. George Brown is extinct. Nor is the accident of his birth either a recommendation or an impediment to the meanest inhabitant of Canada.

Later on The Mail in wrath declaimed:

The Grit organ in this city yesterday resumed the tactics that disgraced it in the past, in endeavoring to set Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion. Against this villainous policy we appeal to every patriot in the country. Was not Confederation carried as the only means of averting civil war and keeping Upper and Lower Canada from cutting each other's throats? For the sake of building up the fallen fortunes of a Faction are we to return to the lamentable days of 1863? Electors of Ontario! If you value the new order of things inaugurated by Confederation set your faces against this unholy attempt to promote sectional hatred. If you value unity among the provinces, be not led away by the harangues of this breeder of quarrels. If you desire that your present prosperity should continue, do not destroy it by creating discord among your countrymen. If you love Canada take care that you do not assist in rending her asunder. . . . Desperate indeed must be the cause that needs national discord to support it; and utterly bereft of principle must be the men who would have this province accomplish the ruin of the whole country that they may be temporarily benefited. It is truly fit and proper that their allies in Quebec are traitors; in New Brunswick, traitors; in Nova Scotia, traitors—bleds of a feather with a common aim, companions in an united effort to subvert the constitution for their individual gain, ranked together to combat Union and Progress.

This attitude was kept up for years and as late as Nov. 20, 1885, The Mail said:

The Mail has been the friend of the French-Canadian people through good and evil report, because it has learned to admire their many sterling qualities, among which sound common sense has always shone pre-eminent.

Then came the great break, and three days later, in the famous article on "A Grave Crisis," the paper which had just praised the common sense of the French Canadians said:

Hitherto the French race in Canada has been fairly treated. . . . Yet after efforts to establish amicable relations with them, even at the sacrifice of prosperity, the French Canadians are now seeking to compel us to recognize their right to suspend the operations of the law whenever a representative of their church feels it to be his interest to do so. But let us solemnly assure them again that, rather than submit to such a yoke, Ontario would smash Confederation into its original fragments, preferring that the dream of a united Canada should be shattered forever, than that unity should be purchased at the expense of equality.

While on the 30th of the month it referred to the deliverance of Quebec and the Dominion into the hands of French Canadian nationalism and intolerance. Its continued attacks upon these people are well known to everybody.

The Catholic Crusade.

This leads one naturally to a contemplation of The Mail's course regarding the Roman Catholic population of Canada, one of the outcomes of spite against Sir John Macdonald. How the paper used to rage at The Globe, and who does not remember its warning to the Catholic League, in April, 1872. Perhaps some do not; here is it:

Some months ago a league was formed in this city with the avowed object of bringing the Catholics of Ontario to their political knees. . . . Its ostensible object was to combat. Unity hurts no race or religion; least of all Irish Catholics, whose influence in Canada and Ireland has always been weakened by dissension, petty jealousies and defection. The program of the league was a good one. The political elevation of a compact voting one-fifth the population of Ontario was a wholesome and patriotic ambition.

Proceeding, The Mail warns its Catholic friends not to make their league a tool in the hands of the Grits, as some seemed disposed to do, and said:

We need not tell our Catholic friends that their union with