and modify my course with regard to the separate schools and the French language. I desire to give that statement the most emphatic and unqualified contradiction. (Loud and prolonged applause.) A great public newspaper, which does me the honor to criticise my course and speak in kind terms of me, says that I am a man of honor. That same newspaper, in an article dealing with this question, said that it thought there might be some truth in that statement. I would rather not have the compliment paid than have the accusation hurled against me. (Great applause.) Why, sir, if I did a thing like that I would not only be the most consummate ass—(applause and laughter)—but I would be the veriest scoundrel in the face of my fellow-citizens. (Renewed applause.) I stand by every principle which I endeavored to enunciate in that speech, and will carry out to the legitimate conclusion every proposition laid down in that platform. (Great applause.) I made up my mind to take the course I took not without deliberation and not without full consideration. I knew that cries would be hurled against me from one end of the country to the other; I knew that it would be said that I was intolerant, that I was bigoted, that I desired to raise religious and race cries in this peaceful province of Ontario; I knew that my intimate friends of the Roman Catholic religion, who are sensitive upon this matter, would be affected considerably; I knew that the result might be that many followers and friends of the Conservative party might flock away to the other side in the coming elections; I knew that the effect might be that they would be misled by cries of this kind and believe that there was some truth in these charges—yet so convinced was I of the justice of the position, so convinced was I that the public interest of this province imperatively demanded that this position should be taken, that the law of right and justice demanded it, that I felt bound to stand by these principles, enunciate them, and endeavor to carry them into practice whatever the consequences might be. (Loud applause.) I am here to-day holding up that standard in this election, and ask the vote of my fellow-citizens upon it as part of the policy of the Conservative party, and let me tell you, sir, that though it may be said, and is said, that there are men of the Opposition who are not heartily in accord with me in that policy, that, too, is a slander and an untruth. Every man who sits upon the Opposition side of the House is heartily in accord with the policy on which we are going to the country. (Cheers.) Now, I think it was a great pity that ever it was necessary to establish separate schools in the province of Ontario. (Renewed cheering.) I think it was a most unfortunate thing that the young men and the young women were not

Brought Up Side by Side

in the one school in this province of Ontario. (Loud and prolonged cheers.) I think, sir, that nothing would have tended more to unite us together and to make us, in fact as well as in name, one united people than the associations of the children side by side coming up together. (Cheers.) Let me read to you what a distinguished educationist, himself a Roman Catholic, said. The Right Honorable Thomas Wise in his work on education says. I quote this because it so applicably expresses what I wish to convey. Speaking of a system of separate or denominational schools, he says:

> We grow Protestants and we grow Catholics and degrade seminaries for the universal mind of the country into rival garrisons of faction.

Is that not the true expression of what the effect of the system is? And in view of that, are we not right in saying that it would be a good thing for the province of Ontario that our children should be educated together? Now, I have clipped another little passage from a Roman Catholic book which is used in the French schools in the province of Ontario—Toussaint's History of Canada. I want to read that to show how that views the matters I have been endeavoring to point out to you here.

Catholics and Protestants live in the greatest peace in this country blessed by providence. This happy result is in a great measure owing to our female religious communities where our young daughters receive instruction with the young ladies of the best Protestant families of the country. In these houses the young ladies, Protestant and Catholic, learn to know, to love and to esteem each other, and form friendships which last the whole lifetime.

Does it not happen in the public schools in the province of Ontario, and is that not the strongest testimony in favor of the proposition that I am advancing to you? Now, sir, I am afraid that in this province the hierarchy have a very different view of what the separate school law is to what the people of this country intended it to be. I want to quote to you the language of certain bishops of that church for the purpose of showing the views which they entertain. Now, Archbishop Lynch in his pastoral, on the occasion of an election between Mr. Anglin and one of the school board here, said as follows:

> It is quite erroneous to think that what appertains to the election of separate school trustees is merely a secular matter, and does not touch religion. The Christian education of youth is a religious matter, one to be chiefly directed by the clergy, and especially by the Bishops, who have to answer for the souls of those confided to their care, both parents and children. Now, the election of persons to aid the clergy in their sacred duty of educating youth is a sacred affair.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The church justly and religiously claims the right to define the bounds of her own rights and jurisdiction. Were this in the power of the state the church would not be permitted always to preach the true gospel of Christ. Now, we pronounce that the election of separate school trustees is a religious affair and that each elector must answer before God for his vote.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> We never tried to control our Catholic people in their votes for purely secular concerns, such as for elections of mayor or of aldermen or of members of Parliament, etc., but the election of a separate school trustee, being a religious affair concerning the salvation of souls, it is our duty to interfere and see that proper men are elected. We will conclude, as we did in one of our former letters, "Obey your prelates and be loyal to them, for they watch as having to render an account of your souls, that they may do this with joy and not grief."

And so on. Now, then, in order to show that Archbishop Lynch was not singular in this view, because he was singular in some respects, I want to quote from Bishop O'Connor. In quoting these statements, I may say they have been published, having been already quoted in the House without being contradicted; therefore, I assume them to be authentic. Bishop O'Connor, of Peterboro', is reported as having said:

> A certain band of mercenaries had presumed to condemn him, their bishop, for closing the school house. He took the whole responsibility for closing the school house in the face of those who had wanted to meet there contrary to his wish. Had he not a right to choose his own house if he wanted to do so? And was not the school his house as spiritual head of the diocese? Education was a religious matter, and therefore he must be supreme in that sphere. The foundation of all the education authorized by the church was religion, and in consequence the church must act and defend it when necessary. Some people had dared to ask the reason the church had for demanding changes in the teaching staff of the schools. He did not consider himself called upon to give reasons. In conclusion he said that if those refractory children of the church did not bow to what was deemed right in her interest, he would scorch them, and that he would put them outside the pale of the church.

You see, Mr. Chairman, here is a distinct statement that in these state schools—because they are state schools although separate schools—the bishop claims the right of directing them entirely, and ordering the removal of teachers according to his own free will and pleasure, and he even challenges the right of anybody to question him. How dare trustees question him with regard to them? Now let me read the 16th decree of the seventh council of Quebec, promulgated by Archbishop Duhamel on the 25th October, 1889. This deals with part of Ontario, although it is the council of Quebec. The decree says:

> School commissioners for trustees) as well as parents are, to the best of their power, bound that in the schools under their charge the catechism of Christian doctrine be diligently and accurately taught by the teachers, who there replace the parents. They are likewise bound to render the ministers and pastors of the church such co-operation and obedience as may enable these latter to realize the happy results which naturally flow from a good Catholic school. And since the progress of schools, to a very large extent, depends on the qualification of teachers, they must have great care in providing only good and efficient teachers. Masters or mistresses must not be employed or dismissed by the commissioners (or trustees) without the counsel of the pastor, who is most frequently the best judge in these matters.

There was trouble in the school board at the city of Ottawa. Mr. Frechette was a member of the school board, yet Archbishop Duhamel, acting upon this decree of the council of Quebec, attempted to interfere with the management of the Ottawa schools. A controversy ensued with Mr. Frechette, and I will read to you what the archbishop said, as indicating the position he took in the discussion between himself and the trustees. Mr. Frechette wrote:

> Your grace claimed for the bishop the right of fixing the curriculum, of appointing the time for the different studies; your grace restricted to the will of the parish priest our right of locating schools, of hiring and discharging teachers.

Another portion of the letter said:

> The rejoinder of your grace was prompt and frank—that in a country like this the church asks from the state all that it can get, and reserves the privilege of exacting from Catholics all that it wants.

In reply Archbishop Duhamel wrote:

> Your letter further states, "We could not be mere instruments for the legalization of a will substituted for that recognized in the statute."
>
> This must mean, dear sir, that you will be entirely guided by the statute, and that even if the church should pass a law which she knows to be her duty to pass, you, as trustee, would have the statute against the law of the church, for what you told me when I read the decree was that you could not submit to the duties of co-operation and obedience to the pastors of the church as given in that decree, and that the civil law would guide you in the performance of your duty as a trustee.

In other words, Mr. Frechette claimed that he was a trustee appointed under the statute law of this province, and that there was an attempt to interfere with his rights as an officer of the state. Well, now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to know who took the right position according to the views of the people of this province. The trustee who stated: "I am an officer of the state, entrusted by the state to work the discharge of certain duties, for which I am responsible. I will obey the law which appoints me and prescribes my duty;" or the archbishop who says: "The church says we must direct you in these things. You must obey the law of the church, although you disobey the law of the land?" (Laughter.) I want to know, Mr. Chairman, which is in accordance with the view of the people of the province of Ontario. Now, I want to say a word or two with regard to a gentleman of whom you have perhaps heard a good deal—Archbishop Cleary. (Loud laughter and cheers.) Now, referring to some gentlemen who are acting with what is known as the Equal Rights movement and the humble individual who is addressing you, he says as follows:

> Well they know that it is only in the school-room children can be reared and trained, moulded and fashioned in mind and heart, thought and feeling to the life-long practice of self-government and sterling freedom in the conduct of their lives throughout the highways and byeways of the world towards their eternal destiny as the children of God and heirs to the kingdom of heaven. The diabolical spirit of hatred of religious education has found its way, unfortunately, into the province of Ontario. Satan has raised his standard here, and has sent forth from the gates of hell his army of demons to propagate his wicked maxims throughout the cities and towns of this province. Yielding to his influence the pseudo-Conservative honor has condemned and has announced in his hapless London speech that he will run the sword through the Catholic church and sever the sacred bond of duty and affection and mutual confidence between the bishops, the chief pastors of the flock of Christ, and the faithful people committed to their care. Now, as in all former ages, the successors of the apostles devote their lives wholly and exclusively to the promotion of their people's spiritual and temporal welfare, and to this end they willingly endure untold mental anxieties and labor and fatigue, and are in this country compelled to submit to obloquy and civil calumny and other persecutions in defence of the rights of their flock, more particularly of the lambs of the fold.
>
> I don't know whether he was doing that when he was slashing away at me. (Laughter.) He continues:
>
> It is proposed, however, to set them aside in the matter of education of youth and to substitute for the divine influence and authority of their apostolic office the influence and authority of party politicians and the protection of statecraft, and it is expected by the conservative leader that this is what all Catholic parents will consider with him to accomplish.

The Catholic man who would allow his church in her hour of trial by withdrawing his school tax from the Catholic school, and transferring it to the public school, thereby siding with the enemy, and dishonoring and burning the Catholic church as far as in him lies, cannot complain if he be counted a traitor to his religion, and consequently be deprived of the religious privileges and helps of grace which the church of God dispenses to her faithful and loyal children in life, and at the hour of death.

Now I say, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, that the position taken by those gentlemen of the hierarchy is that the separate schools are simply separate schools in which they rule, that they are simply the end by which they work, and that those taking charge of these schools must place absolute and implicit obedience in the direction of their spiritual teachers. That is an invasion of the prerogative of the state. (Loud applause.) Why, I thought that this battle of church and state had been fought and had been settled, that it had long ago been determined what the bounds of the state jurisdiction and the bounds of religious jurisdiction were, and I thought, too, that in this province at all events there had been absolute separation of church and state from one end of the province to the other. It seemed to me that in this country we did away with connection between church and state in regard to a Protestant church or in regard to Roman Catholics in the province of Ontario. So that against the proposition put forward by these gentlemen I intend to exert my humble influence. (Loud applause.) It never can be permitted in this free country that any church shall usurp the functions of the state. We have determined that one foundation of the Government shall be that education of the young belongs to the state, and that it is the duty of the state to see that every child is instructed and that every citizen contributes to the support of education of every child in the state, and upon that I say that we can squarely and safely stand, and if we permit one plank to slip away, if we permit one rivet to be drawn or one bolt to be shattered, we do not know where the end shall be. (Loud applause.) I stand here now firmly to defend the rights of the state and say that no church, I care not whether Protestant or Catholic, shall intrude within the dominion of the state, within the separate sovereign right of the people. (Great applause.) If the trustees appointed for these separate schools are but machines to be worked by the hierarchy of the province in which these schools exist, then I say better fairly, better decently, give the hierarchy power to appoint these trustees and not make a farce of going through an election; but I say when the people of this country consented to place the Separate School Act on the statute book of this province in 1863, they never understood the meaning of it to be anything of that kind, and they never would have permitted it to pass into law in this country, in this free community, if they had so understood it. (Loud applause.) It is said that the Conservative party are responsible for these amendments; that we remained silent while sitting in the House, and that we assented to them. If an if that were so, is the country to be foreclosed, is the mouth of the country to be shut, is no man to raise his voice and state that this condition of things must be changed? I say no. Make a change if it requires to be made. I do not care who proposes it. I would not mind admitting to my fellow-citizens for the purpose of argument, and granting that I was in the House when these amendments were made, that I never raised my voice against them, but if I am now raising my voice, and I believe that the amendments are bad, and I desire to remove them, what is the duty of the province of Ontario? (Cheers.) Why, sir, you could never have a reform in a country; you would continue in the same state of stagnation down to the end of time if changes were not proposed. It is only by men having their attention directed in this way that these changes are brought about, and that great revisions are made from time to time. It is only in that way our constitution has been brought to its present state of perfection. But I say in regard to many of these amendments I did enter my protest, and I propose to show it from the records which I have before me."

A voice—"Never too late to mend."

Exactly. Now, one point of objection which we make is that provision is made at the public expense for a separate inspection of the separate schools. The expense in itself is not a very great matter—probably $1,200 or $1,300—but my objection is to the principle of further separating the two classes of schools by having a different inspection for the two, instead of having them inspected together. Now, we will see what was said in 1882, when the change was made. The *Mail*, referring to my observation in the Legislature at the time, says:

> He deprecated the appointment of a distinct separate school inspector as being likely to still further divide our schools.

The *Globe* reports me a little more fully. It says:

> Mr. Meredith did not see why the county inspectors of public schools could not also inspect the separate schools and so bring the two systems closer together. He could not help deploring the necessity for separating the children of the province by two systems.

I want to know if there is a gentleman in the room who does not say that that was not fair and right. (Cries of "Yes, yes," and loud applause.) Mr. Mowat and every member of his Cabinet and every follower in the House except Mr. Caldwell, the member for North Lanark, voted against that resolution. Now, I want to point out the course which Mr. Mowat took with regard to this matter. Session before last when the French school question was up a resolution was moved by myself declaring that English should be the language of the schools of the province, and that the text books to be used in the public and separate schools ought to be regulated by the state, except those dealing with matters of religion. Mr. Mowat got up in his place in the House and said he doubted very much whether under the British North America Act we had any power whatever to regulate the text books of the separate schools, and therefore he could not vote for that resolution, although he was in favor of a part of it dealing with the question of English in schools. It struck me as a most extraordinary statement to make and at the time I so characterized it. I said it seemed to me a most extraordinary thing for the Attorney-General of the province to declare that in his judgment he doubted whether there was power in the state to control the state schools although separate schools. That was the position Mr. Mowat then took. What did he do last session? Last session, when he was making a speech on this school question, he declared that he had not fully considered the matter the previous session, and now he was of the opinion that if the matter were taken to the Privy Council the result would be that the state had authority to control the text books and supervise their schools. I thought we had him pretty fast. When I put this resolution in shape Mr. Mowat began to backslide. He was not then quite as sure. He did not think it would be safe to do this until he had the authority of the highest court of the British Empire. Therefore he voted against the resolution. You know he is a great constitutional lawyer. He has a perfect monomania for taking these cases to the Privy Council, and I venture to say if he had not been afraid of his friend Mr. Fraser, who sat close to him at his right hand, he would not have backed down from the position he had taken the day before. (Hear, hear.) I want for a moment to refer to another document from the pen of my distinguished friend the Archbishop of Kingston. (Applause and laughter.) The public, I think, were startled by the document that appeared in the public press as being a pastoral of the archbishop on the 24th February, 1890. In this pastoral he speaks as follows:

> If unhappily there be any Catholic ratepayers who, in this hour of conflict between the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of Christ, deliberately choose to side with the enemy for the gradual destruction of Catholic education in this province, I hereby charge you, as the pastor of the souls of your people and guardians of the right of Jesus Christ and His church, to call upon every such ratepayer before the 1st of next March, and obtain from him in my name and authority as his bishop that:
>
> 1. His action in this matter is rebellion against the church, and he must confess it in my presence pronounced by the Son of God, "If any man will not hear the church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."
>
> 2. That I hereby reserve to myself alone, or, in my absence from the diocese, to the administrator for the time being, all the power of absolving such rebellious Catholic from his sins unless he shall have signed a written declaration, or ordered it to be signed by others, that he heartily repents of having injured the church and scandalized his neighbors by his withdrawal of his taxes from Catholic education, and shall have promised to become a supporter of the separate school at the earliest opportunity. On receipt of this declaration in writing any priest of my diocese may absolve him.

That is to say that he denies the last rites of the church to any man of his church so long as he refuses to sign a declaration in favor of supporting the separate schools. He goes on to say:

> 3. This reservation of faculties applies to the crime of death as strictly as at any other time. * * * But neither in life nor in death can a sinner be validly absolved without true contrition for his sins and firm purpose of amendment and reparation as far as in him lies, of the injury done by him to individuals or to the church. In artificial mortis, so long as they persist in their rebellious disposition and refuse to sign the written declaration aforesaid, or order it to be signed in their name. And should any of them unhappily die in that state, I hereby ordain that no public mass shall be offered nor any public prayers said for his soul, nor shall his corpse be admitted into the church, nor any bell be tolled for announcement of his death or burial, nor shall it be lawful for any priest to attend his funeral.
>
> 5. The pastor of each mission is hereby required to send to the bishop, as soon as possible after the 1st of March, a list of the names of all, should there be any, who have declared against supporting the separate schools.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say nothing against the distinguished dignitary of a great and historic church, but I do assert that it almost makes one's blood run cold to read words such as these applied to the refusal of man to exercise that right which the state confers upon them, and which the state declares shall be subject to their voluntary will. (Loud applause.) Are the people of this province going to submit to that kind of thing? (Cries of "No.") Can it be tolerated that the enjoyment of the civil rights of men shall be dealt with as that pastoral deals with them? (No, no.) Now, I hope the archbishop made a mistake in a statement which I find at the end of this pastoral, but if true I must say I deeply regret the statement which I am now about to read to you. Advising the priests to whom he addressed the pastoral he says:

> Dear Rev. Father, I have not deemed it necessary heretofore to make the withdrawal of support from Catholic schools a reserved case, although the other bishops of the province have done so.
>
> I did think that probably Archbishop Cleary, who is a hot man and a hasty man, might have done something in his haste probably not in accordance with the views of the other bishops of the church, but here is the declaration in his letter to the clergy that he was the last man to do it, that he had delayed doing it and that the other bishops throughout the province had made these "reserved cases" before him. I hope and trust that is not so, but if it be so, then I say it is ten times more imperatively the duty of the people of this country, Catholic and Protestant, to speak out against this tyranny, this wrong, this outrage, upon them. (Great applause.) In the state of New Jersey a similar question has arisen. A distinguished member of the church proclaimed some such doctrine as that proclaimed by the bishop of Kingston. They do in New Jersey in regard to the matter? It was proposed to enact a law in the state declaring that it should be a penal offence to interfere with the rights of civil liberty, and that great paper, the New York *Times*, said it was the work of the state to protect itself. The result was the pastoral was withdrawn and the bishop had to take back what he had said. (Applause.) My position is this: We have separate schools under the constitution. It is to be regretted our Roman Catholic friends cannot do without them. But if these schools are to exist only under the ideas pronounced by the bishops, then I say an agitation should be inaugurated that will wipe them out of existence.

A Voice—You have got my vote, my boy.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have spoken at greater length than I originally intended to—(cries: "No, no." "Go on")—but I hope I have given no offence to anyone, no matter to what creed, religion or nationality he may belong. I have dealt with matters pertaining only to civil rights, and I would consider myself, as a public man, nothing more or less than a craven or coward if I did not stand up for civil rights, no matter by whom they may be assailed. It is said I am to be a Protestant crusader. I do not occupy any such position. I am acting solely in the defence of civil and religious liberty. The platform on which I stand to-day is broad enough for every liberal-minded Roman Catholic to stand on. In a discussion like this we are apt to get bitter, and perhaps use intemperate language, but I wish to utterly repudiate any such statement as has been made, that the subject upon which I am speaking is a no popery cry, raised to make disunion among the religious classes of the people. There is no bigotry in the province of Ontario. The public man who would appeal to the province of Ontario under such a banner would make a sad mistake. I do, however, say this, that there should be the broadest tolerance in matters of conscience in this land. I do not care at what altar a man bends. I respect his religious conviction and give him every scope. We have shown in this province that there is no country under the sun in which there is greater freedom than that enjoyed by our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. There is no reason why a Roman Catholic may not exercise his liberty just as a Protestant may, and if it be that the Catholic is sometimes, by the prejudice of his fellow-men, prevented from obtaining a position which his standing and intelligence in the community entitles him to, it is caused by the evil of dividing our school system and sending a portion of our people to the separate schools. It is due to that, and perhaps also to the fact that occasionally our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens instead of uniting with the rest of the community separate themselves from it. I believe that if we all met in the same school and were educated together the next generation would see a different side of the case and there would be broader liberality amongst us. (Cheers.) Now, sir, we are upon the eve of battle, one of the most important battles that have been fought in the province, a battle that is to be fought with weal or woe to Ontario. We have a good cause. I believe the standard which we raise on high is the standard under which every true citizen may honestly, conscientiously and fairly fight. I trust that no man in this province during the contest will sully this standard by saying aught to offend the feelings of any Roman Catholic. I do protest against these attacks upon the religious observances of the Roman Catholic church, and do ask that the intelligent men of this country exercise their judgment and influence upon those who are more easily led away and see that nothing is said that shall give offence. we are fighting for a noble cause, we are fighting for principle and we are fighting for liberty, civil and religious, and it would be a shame and a disgrace if there should be found in the ranks of this noble cause those who would say aught to give offence, and I therefore call upon every man who looks to the banner that I will have the honor of upholding in the coming fight to recognize the rights of his fellow-man, and to do nothing to offend the most scrupulous feelings of any man in the course of the great controversy upon which we are entering. This is a somewhat mixed controversy. We have the Third Party men, we have the Equal Rights men, we have the Conservatives, we have the Liberals and we have the young men of the country who perhaps have not allied themselves to any party. To them especially I appeal. They are even more interested than we that the elder, upon whom rest must depend the future of the country. I ask them to consider these questions. I want them to reflect in their sober judgment the issues now being discussed, and, let me say, prayerfully consider them, in order that they may arrive at a just conclusion in the interests of the country, and when they have formed their conclusion they will themselves raise the principles which we think right. You have heard the principles we advocate. We intend, if we go into power, to put these principles into force. Every man who has in view these principles is bound to march under the banner which I have the honor on this occasion to uphold." (Applause.) I must thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the kind attention you have given me. I have spoken at greater length than I had intended, and have a great deal yet before me, but I will ask you before concluding to apply these principles. It matters little what becomes of politicians and parties. These principles are of great moment and must not be lost sight of in the controversy. And it seems to me there never was a time in the history of this province when these principles were placed more at stake than they are now. I again appeal to you not to mind the old party names or cries; not to be led away with the idea that the Opposition has died and is not fit to take office, because I say there is no ground whatever for that charge. There is no reason why men following the Liberal party may not range themselves under our banner. Now I leave the matter in your hands. This is the first speech I have delivered in the course of this campaign. The cause is your cause as well as mine, and I ask you to consider the questions which I have discussed fairly and make up your minds upon them. Remember that every vote you cast in favor of the Government of Mr. Mowat means that you will deny the ballot to the separate schools, every vote you will cast for Mr. Mowat means that you approve of his policy with regard to the French language in the schools; every vote you cast for Mr. Mowat means that you approve of continuing the system of special inspection of separate schools, and every vote you cast for him means that you are in favor of refusing that text books in use in the schools shall be controlled by the state; and it will, by means, to a large extent, the recognition of the principle underlying the separate schools which the Government have contended for and which I have objected to in the course of the observations I have made during the evening. (Loud applause.) In leaving the matter in your hands I may fairly say that the watchword of the party which I have the honor to lead in this campaign may without irreverence be said to be: "For God and my right." (Tremendous applause, during which Mr. Meredith resumed his seat.)

The Mayor Speaks.

In answer to loud calls for a speech Mayor Clarke came forward, and was received with hearty cheers. His worship expressed the opinion that there did not exist a single individual in the vast audience before him who had not enjoyed the noble speech delivered by his hon. friend and leader, Mr. Meredith. He had pleasure in feeling sure that the great majority of the people of the Queen City of the West were in favor of the views of Mr. Meredith. He felt, whoever was selected to carry the standard of the Liberal-Conservative party, Toronto at any rate could be depended upon to do her duty, and the indications were that Mr. Meredith would be triumphantly returned as the leader of the Government on June 5. He expressed fully his sympathy with every word that had fallen from Mr. Meredith's lips. If the leader of the Opposition was elected to govern the province, no man need feel afraid that he would be deprived of any civil or religious rights. He (the mayor) believed separate schools should not be in existence, and he hoped the day was not far distant when they would be a thing of the past. The friendships that are formed in schools were enduring, and he believed the people of the province, notwithstanding every statement to the contrary, would be more prosperous and happier than they at present are if common schools were altogether in existence and the children be educated side by side. The no popery cry brought forward in certain quarters against Mr. Meredith was an injustice to a man whose honor and integrity and high principle had never been questioned. The man was incapable of doing anything that deprived any class or section of the community of their just rights. The present Government had been in power for the past eighteen years, but no one who had followed the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, and through the medium of the press they would be flashed throughout the length and breadth of the land, could doubt that so long as Mr. Meredith lived he should have a large majority in the local House of this great and noble province. The speaker concluded by again expressing his sympathy with every word uttered by Mr. Meredith, which he felt sure every person who had the honor of listening to him would remember for many a long day to come. The mayor resumed his seat amid tremendous applause.

Closing Remarks.

Mr. J. H. Worrell, Q.C., then came forward and read the following motion, which was seconded by Mr. J. H. Ferguson:

> Resolved, that this meeting having heard Mr. Meredith's able declaration of the policy of himself and the Opposition in the Local Legislature, especially in regard to the question of separate schools and the teaching of French in the public schools, hereby expresses their cordial approval of the same and pledges themselves to do all in their power to return Mr. Meredith and his political friends to power.

Mr. Worrell requested all who were in favor of the resolution to rise, and it is no exaggeration to say not a single individual in the hall remained seated. The vast multitude rose in a body and actually stood on the chairs, and the enthusiasm and cheering was so great that the rafters of the building shook.

Mr. Meredith smilingly bowed his acknowledgments, and after vociferously cheering that gentleman and singing the national anthem the audience dispersed.

After the meeting had closed Mr. Meredith received the most hearty and equally well-deserved congratulations from a number of personal and intimate friends for his magnificent and able effort, and it was nearly an hour before he could make his escape to his hotel in order to obtain a well-deserved and honorably earned night's rest.

Refusing a Secret Ballot.

It is well known that the ballot at Ontario elections is not a secret one, but that by means of the number on the back it may be known for whom an elector has voted, thus opening the way for bribery and intimidation and vitiating the principle for which the ballot was established. Last session Mr. A. F. Wood, of Hastings, introduced the following bill to make the ballot a secret one:

> "Whereas the provisions of the Ontario Election Act do not secure a secret ballot at elections of members of the Legislative Assembly, and it is essential to the efficiency and security of the system of voting by ballot that the ballot should be a secret one; and whereas the provisions of the Municipal Act, which secure a secret ballot at elections of mayors, aldermen, reeves and other members of municipal councils, have been found to work satisfactorily, and it is expedient to amend the Ontario Election Act so as to make the ballot at elections of members of the Legislative Assembly similar to the ballot provided for municipal elections;
>
> "Therefore her majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, enacts as follows:
>
> "1. So much of sub-section 4 of section 63 of the Ontario Election Act as provides that every ballot paper shall have a number printed on the back thereof, and that the same number shall be printed on the face of the counterfoil attached thereto is hereby repealed, and hereafter neither the ballot nor the counterfoil shall be numbered.
>
> "2. So much of sub-section 9 of section 90 of the said Act as provides that the deputy returning officer shall write or otherwise mark on the counterfoil the number produced to the name upon the voter's list of a person presenting himself for the purpose of voting is hereby repealed, and hereafter such number shall not be written or marked thereon."

But Messrs. Fraser and Mowat were not willing that electors should have the protection of a secret ballot, and with the aid of the following members rejected this bill (Votes and Proceedings March 12, p. 197):

Allan,	Harcourt,
Armstrong,	Hardy,
Awrey,	Leys,
Ballantyne,	Lyon,
Bishop,	McAndrew,
Bizard,	McKay,
Bronson,	McLaughlin,
Caldwell,	McMahon,
Clarke (Wellington),	Mack,
Connee,	Mackenzie,
Dack,	Master,
Dance,	Morin,
Davis,	Mowat,
Drury,	Murray,
Dryden,	O'Connor,
Evanturel,	Phelps,
Ferguson,	Rayside,
Field,	Robillard,
Fraser,	Ross (Huron),
Freeman,	Ross (Middlesex),
Garson,	Smith (York),
Gibson (Hamilton),	Snider,
Gibson (Huron),	Sprague,
Gilmour,	Stratton,
Gould,	Waters,
Graham,	Wood (Brant).
Guthrie,	

What do old Reformers think of these men?

The License Iniquity.

The records show the Mowat Government's course on the license question to be exceptionally bad. The power of appointing license commissioners was taken over from the municipalities with the express promise by Mr. Mowat that independent boards would be appointed. But the system soon became a gigantic engine of partisan injustice and intolerable coercion. So much so that during the session of 1889 the Opposition directed attention to the scandals of the system and recited the chief complaints in the following motion, moved by Mr. Meredith, seconded by Mr. Creighton, March 14 (Journals, p. 114):

> "That all the words in the motion after 'that' be omitted, and the following substituted therefore: 'The present mode of administering the liquor license laws through the board of commissioners and inspectors appointed by the Government of the day has resulted in a partisan administration of the law; has subjected those engaged in the liquor traffic to undue influence by and in the interest of the dominant party in this province; has led in many cases to the tyrannical exercise of the powers of the commissioners and inspectors, and in others to the lax enforcement of the law and the condoning for partisan purposes of offences against its provisions; has unduly and unfairly interfered with the freedom of exercising their franchise by those engaged in the liquor traffic, and is otherwise mischievous in its purpose and operation; and while declaring its firm intention and purpose to be not to relax or impair the efficiency of the other provisions of the law, and particularly those limiting the number of licenses to be granted, this House is of opinion that it is essential to the honest, non-partisan and faithful execution of the liquor license laws that the present mode of appointing boards of commissioners should be abrogated, and provision be made for placing the appointment of the commissioners in the hands of a body more removed from the influence of partisanship, and more directly responsible to and under the control of the people.'"

Declining to remedy any of the evils brought to their attention, the Government and their followers voted it down, but during the late session the Opposition again brought forward the matter and propounded their policy for the removal of the injurious system in the following proposition moved April 2nd by Mr. Meredith, seconded by Mr. Creighton, in amendment to the Government's license bill, which was then being read a third time (Votes and Proceedings 1890, p. 307):

> "That the bill be not now read a third time, but be forthwith referred back to a committee of the whole House with instructions to amend the same so as to provide that the license commissioners shall hereafter be appointed in counties by the county councils, and in cities and towns separated from counties shall be elected by the municipal electors of such city or town."

But Mr. Mowat refused to give up the power which the political control of licenses gave him as a party engine, and called on his followers, who voted it down as follows (Votes and Proceedings, p. 307):

Allan,	Harcourt,
Armstrong,	Hardy,
Awrey,	Leys,
Balfour,	Lyon,
Ballantyne,	McAndrew,
Bishop,	McKay,
Blezard,	McLaughlin,
Caldwell,	McMahon,
Chisholm,	Mack,
Clarke (Wellington),	Mackenzie,
Connee,	Master,
Dack,	Miller,
Dance,	Morin,
Davis,	Mowat,
Drury,	Murray,
Dryden,	O'Connor,
Evanturel,	Phelps,
Ferguson,	Rayside,
Field,	Robillard,
Fraser,	Ross (Huron),
Freeman,	Ross (Middlesex),
Garson,	Smith (York),
Gibson (Hamilton),	Snider,
Gibson (Huron),	Sprague,
Gilmour,	Stratton,
Gould,	Waters,
Graham,	Wood (Brant).

For this vote alone every one of these men should be defeated at the polls.

The Reform They Refuse.

From whatever point of view you consider it the policy of the Mowat Government toward the French schools has been atrociously bad. There have been various stages in the carrying out of the policy, each stage worse than the one preceding it, the whole culminating in the rejection of the wise and effectual Opposition proposals for reform.

First, the Minister of Education began by legalizing through official regulations a state of things merely permitted to exist before.

Then the revelation of the real conditions was met by hot denials and false charges of trumped-up stories.

Quick upon this followed the appeals to race prejudice, so that the French people might be consolidated against the needed reforms.

After the confirmation of the facts by a Government investigation, wholly useless and inadequate regulations were put forth, not enforced, and never intended to be enforced.

That was the state of affairs when the Legislature met in January last. The Opposition submitted their proposal in the form of a bill—definite, thorough and effectual. It was prepared in view of the fact that (1) English was being excluded from a large number of public schools; (2) English taxpayers were forced to send their children elsewhere to get an education; (3) text books with hostile teachings were employed in the schools; (4) the Quebec Nationalists, the allies of Mr. Mowat's Government, had boasted of their peaceful conquest of Ontario; (5) their doctrines were inculcated in public schools by the aid of the money of the whole people of Ontario. The bill contained the following provisions:

> 1. English shall be the language of every public and separate school in this province.
>
> 2. Save as provided by section 7 of this Act, no other language than the English shall be taught in any public or separate school in this province.
>
> 3. No teacher shall be employed or permitted to teach in any public or separate school in this province unless he is capable of speaking the English language and of conducting the proceedings of his school according to the programme of studies applicable thereto in that language.
>
> 4. Nothing herein contained is to prevent a teacher, where it is impracticable by reason of any pupil not being able to understand the instruction which he desires to convey if given in English, from imparting it to him in any language which such pupil is able to understand.
>
> 5. It shall be the duty of the school inspector to report at least once in every six months upon every school under his charge in which any other language than the English is taught, and in such report to certify as to whether the provisions of this Act are being complied with, and any violations thereof which have taken place, and also to report at least once in every six months the number of pupils attending each school under his charge who are not able to receive instruction by means of the English tongue.
>
> 6. Every teacher who shall be guilty of a wilful violation of the provisions of this Act shall be disqualified from teaching in any public or separate school in this province.
>
> 7. And whereas in certain portions of the province it has been permitted for many years past that a language other than the English be taught in the schools, and it is expedient to make temporary provision with regard to the schools therein, it is therefore enacted that in those parts of the province in which schools now exist wherein any language other than the English is taught, such other language may, until the Legislature shall otherwise enact, be continued to be taught for such period not exceeding one hour per day, as the trustees may direct.
>
> Provided always that the instruction given in such other language shall not interfere with, but shall be in addition to, the course of study in English prescribed for such schools, that only such text books shall be used as shall be authorized by regulation of the Department of Education, that such instruction shall be confined to reading, grammar and composition, and shall be given only to those pupils whose parents or guardians shall request it.
>
> 8. If it shall appear by the report of the inspector that the provisions of this Act are not being in good faith carried out in any school, the provisions of section 7 shall, after notice has been given to the trustees of the school of such report, and failure by them for one month to remedy what is reported against, cease to apply to such school.
>
> 9. All regulations of the Department of Education inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby abrogated and repealed.

This measure met every feature of the case and would have remedied the defect in the public school system as the Ross method cannot possibly hope to do. Yet it was voted down by the following supporters of the Government:

Allan,	Graham,
Armstrong,	Harcourt,
Awrey,	Hardy,
Balfour,	Leys,
Ballantyne,	Lyon,
Bishop,	McAndrew,
Blezard,	McKay,
Caldwell,	McLaughlin,
Chisholm,	McMahon,
Clarke (Wellington),	Mack,
Connee,	Mackenzie,
Dack,	Master,
Dance,	Morin,
Davis,	Mowat,
Drury,	O'Connor,
Dryden,	Phelps,
Evanturel,	Robillard,
Ferguson,	Ross (Huron),
Field,	Ross (Middlesex),
Fraser,	Smith (York),
Freeman,	Snider,
Garson,	Sprague,
Gibson (Hamilton),	Stratton,
Gibson (Huron),	Waters,
Gilmour,	Wood (Brant).
Gould,	

Let the electors remember these men and their refusal to rid Ontario of a serious problem and prevent the introduction of a dual language difficulty in this province.