KING DODDS FLAILS MARTER.

A Conservative on the Result of the London Election.

EX-ALD. E. KING DODDS, the able editor of the *Spectator*, scarifies things in general over the London election, in even more than his usual trenchant style. In his last issue he thus discourses:—

"Only a man so saturated with partizan bigotry as to be willfully blind can be surprised at the defeat of the Conservative candidate in London on Tuesday last. Mr. Essery's election last January as mayor of the western city was a stain upon the intelligence of the citizens and if they had selected him now as their representative in the Legislature after ten months' experience of him as their chief magistrate they would have proved themselves unfit to exercise the highest privilege of freemen.

Mr. Essery in January last defeated a better man than himself by his disgraceful appeals to religious bigotry. Knowing the Protestant electors of London far outnumbered their Roman Catholic fellow citizens, he by every art in his power aroused the passions of the less intelligent of the protestant electorate and was borne on the wave of fanaticism he had created into the Mayor's chair. It is cause for congratulation that such furious outbursts of bigotry have but a brief existence in Ontario at the present day. The high intelligence of our people may for a time be clouded by passion, but a sober second thought soon asserts itself and then they are even more ready to crucify the bigot than to crown him. Such has been the fate of Mayor Essery, his championship of Mr. Meredith's cause in the late general election nearly cost the opposition leader his seat, and a majority that according to the judgment of the best posted men in London ought to have been between four and five hundred was reduced to 137, largely through the wild harangues of this furious demagogue.

Heavy though the load was that the Conservative party had to carry in such a candidate the burden was increased when they imported Mr. Marter, the opposition leader, into the campaign. The torch of religious intolerance had been held aloft by the candidate and his leader appeared equally willing to assist in keeping it blazing. The two speeches he made in London were the sorriest political deliverances that ever issued from the mouth of a member of the Legislature, much less from one who for the time being at any rate, poses as a political leader. It was the veriest twaddle ever heard outside the circle of a country debating club, and no wonder that those who listened to it marvelled that such a man should pose as a leader of anything more pretentious than a tea party.

The large majority gained by Mr. Marter in North Toronto no doubt influenced outsiders to the opinion that he was an able politician; the real truth is that the man opposed to him was, if possible, a bigger crank than himself, and the electors chose what they considered at the time to be the lesser evil of the two. Had he have remained away from London it might have been possible for the Conservatives up there to claim that an able man had been selected to fill Mr. Meredith's position, but it was not possible to make them believe any such story after they had listened to his small talk. The descent from William Ralph Meredith to Marter is too unfathomable for the common mind to grapple with, and those electors of London who heard his speeches in favor of Mr. Essery must have been paralyzed with astonishment at such a man being chosen successor to so able a predecessor.

The editor of this paper is known as a staunch Conservative all over Canada, but he considers it cause for general congratulation in view of the bigoted appeals made in his behalf that the party candidate was not only defeated in London, but defeated largely through the influence of the Conservative support given to his opponent. Mr. Marter may in the strength of his own conceit imagine himself a sounder Protestant than those who proclaim their faith in less public places than in the market squares and on the house tops, but the severe rebuke administered to him by this London election ought to convince him that the intelligence of the Canadian electorate condemns all such appeals as he indulged in. Again, his declaration on the Prohibition question was such a bigoted one that fair minded people resented it. He is one of the temperance by Act of Parliament advocates, who believe in passing such legislation without a cent of compensation to the men engaged in the business, and for narrow minded extremists of that character the electors have very little use. Mr. Marter's personal opinions on any public question are not of any moment, but what he says in his official capacity, as leader of the Conservative party in the Ontario Legislature attracts some public attention, and we once more express our intense satisfaction that the electors of London administered to him such a scathing rebuke. The parish politics of Muskoka, in which school he was educated, won't do in the broader arena of provincial legislation, and we much fear Mr. Marter wasn't caught young enough to make him a broad and liberal minded citizen.

FRONT OR SIDE DOOR.

Which Shall the People of New York use on Sunday.

THE agitation in New York in favor of opening the barrooms for certain hours on Sunday has been taken up by the New York *Herald*, which is printing pages of interviews with leading men on both sides of the question. The consensus of opinion so far obtained is certainly in favor of doing away with Sunday closing. New York has tried it and it has failed. Sensibly the people say, if you cannot enforce a law do away with it and try something else. Here is what the *Herald* says editorally:

Next to the municipal reform measures that will come up at Albany in January no question of greater interest and importance to the people of this city is likely to claim the attention of the Legislature than that touching the Excise law in its application to Sunday.

The existing law requires all saloons to be closed on that day, and makes the sale of any kind of liquor in them a criminal offence. But as everybody knows this law has never been enforced except in a sporadic way, and except in that way it probably never will be enforced. It has not been enforced because its enforcement has not been demanded by popular sentiment. Its very existence on the statute book has but served as a weapon for police blackmail and political intimidation.

Whether the custom now general in spite of the law can be recognized by the Legislature and made lawful with advantage to the community; whether, in other words, the opening of saloons on Sunday under proper restrictions is desirable or undesirable, is a problem on which opinions will naturally differ. On this question the *Herald* gives on another page this morning some interesting views in addition to those presented yesterday.

There are those in the community who will take a strict or puritanical view of the matter, as they do of all matters relating to Sunday observance. They will see in the legalized opening of saloons on that day a "desecration of the Sabbath," a dangerous move toward a "Continental Sunday," an innovation from which no good and only evil can come. They will treat it as a license for intemperance and disorder on the very day when above all others such evils should be suppressed and as a legislative recognition of gin-mills, dives and dens, whose privileges should be curtailed rather than extended.

On the other hand, there are those who will view the matter in a more liberal light. They will concede the greatest individual freedom consistent with the public good and the rights of all. They will hold that a law which is a dead letter because it is not supported by popular sentiment may be safely modified or repealed; that a custom which has been general for years past and is likely to be general for years to come, in spite of its rigid Prohibition, may be sanctioned under restrictions without detriment to the community or infringement of the rights of those who whish to enjoy a quiet, peaceful, orderly Sunday; that, in short, a limited and regulated opening of saloons on Sunday may be permitted with safety and advantage.

This we must say is the more sensible as well as more liberal view. It is to be remembered that New York is not a puritanical town of the past century, but a cosmopolitan metropolis of a liberal and progressive age. Its teeming population is made up of all nationalities, of people from every clime. It embraces hundreds of thousands of German citizens and citizens of other nationalities to whom Sunday is a day of innocent enjoyment and recreation, and the beer hall, with its music and other attractions, a family resort. There they enjoy themselves without disorder or intemperance, without interfering with the rights or comforts of others. This custom has extended to Americans, and even the working man who remains at home has come to regard beer or light wine as a daily necessity.

Of course Sunday opening is not to be encouraged except under restrictions that will be a guaranty against any abuse of the privilege and any evil to society. Any general licensing of rum shops or toleration of disorder or intemperance is not to be countenanced. The right to keep open should be limited to certain hours and granted by special license only to places which will not abuse the privilege and on conditions which will require the business to be conducted in a quiet, orderly way and without interfering with the usual observance of the day.

This is done with advantage in many cities of Europe, and it can be done with advantage here. Properly restricted there is no more objection to it in the estimation of a majority of citizens than there is to Sunday excursions during the summer. If we are not mistaken, Mayor Hewitt favored the step during his term of office, and Mayor Strong may well favor it when he comes in.

OF LICENSE AND LIBERTY.

MR. W. S. CAINE is a very good and honest man, according to the *South Eastern Gazette*, which is, however, careful to add that it is only recently that it seems to have struck him that it was desirable to tell the real truth of the temperance movement as he understands it. Says our Maidstone contemporary: Mr. Caine stated at Liverpool on Friday that the Gothenburg system was no use, and drink if sold by a bishop was as injurious as if sold by a publican. He added, "It is not drunkards so much as moderate drinkers who were the friends of the publicans." If this be so, continues the *Gazette*, what becomes of all the tearful stuff turned out from teetotal meetings about the crime and lunacy resulting from drunkenness? One does not like to say it is hypocrisy, but would it not be honester to say that this crusade is not against the drunkard, who is a useless nuisance and one of a small majority, but against the moderate drinker, who is one of the great majority? It is open for them to say that moderate drinking is as bad as excessive drinking. Let them say so and cease to insult the majority of self-reliant and healthy-minded people by assuming that everyone who uses a public house is a drunkard *in esse* or *in posse*. The public would then be the better able to understand the aim of the teetotal fanatics, namely, to restrict not only license but liberty.

ROSEBERY'S RUFFLE

LORD ROSEBERY in his Glasgow speech cut a very sorry figure, says the London *Herald*. In order to soften the hearts of Mr. Caine and his faction, he promised that the Local Veto Bill should be reintroduced next Session in an altered form although almost in the same breath he admitted that there was no chance of passing it. His lordship said that they "would never be able to deal with the question in a piecemeal fashion, but they were to grapple with it properly the would need all the force of a great Parliamentary majority, and a whole Parliamentary Session. The Government had not the force; but this he could promise that it was their purpose during next Session to reintroduce a Liquor Veto Bill and to press it as far as Parliamentary time and Parliamentary circumstances permitted of their doing so." There is no occasion to offer much comment upon such a miserable statement—a statement wretched one was probably never made by any responsible Minister of the Crown—for it simply amounts to this, that calmly and deliberately proposes to waste the time of the Legislature and of the country in prosecuting a measure which he admits that he does not believe in, and which he knows cannot be advanced beyond a certain stage, and will then have to be ignominiously withdrawn, so that every minute spent upon it will be much time wasted. But it means hoodwinking the Trade and causing depreciation of its property, and all this to soothe the vanity and to secure the votes of some half-a-dozen fanatical supporters of the Government.

PIC-NIC parties should not fail to include in the lunch basket a supply of ST. JACOBS OIL. For Sprains, Bruises, Insect Bites, Sunburn, Headache, Neuralgia, &c., it is invaluable . . . .
A good rubbing with the Oil after a day's outing will both surprise and delight you . . .

JOB PRINTING... "ADVOCATE"
Send for Estimates
9½ ADELAIDE ST. EAST, TORONTO
Telephone 1800....