

the serious meaning of this emphatic expression of the people's will. I fully and gladly appreciate the fact that Liberals in large numbers joined in that expression." That his appreciation might be more generally known by the Liberal party Mr. Whitney wired the same message to The Globe. The day after the election the Mail and Empire acknowledged the assistance which Liberals had rendered in defeating the Government. On the same day The Toronto World said editorially: "An issue, indeed, so vital for the future of free government in Ontario could not be made a party question, and, as Mr. Whitney declared, the victory of his cause could not be regarded as a mere party triumph. And he will be the first to recognize that the sweep which he has made throughout the length and breadth of the Province has been due in no small degree to the independent and honorable action of the many Liberals who have subordinated for patriotic reasons their party to their principles."

Under the circumstances it was suggested that the new Government would be peculiarly free from party bias and be a Government for the whole people. Mr. Whitney in the campaign encouraged the people to entertain this hope. As reported by The News, which very ably supported him, he said at Barrie: "In Ontario they were not so strongly divided on public questions as in the Dominion Parliament, where the larger questions of trade-tariff and relations with the outside world were dealt with. But the time had come in Ontario when all the good men, all Christian men, all men who wished decent government, must get together or violate their consciences, and the Conservatives held that they had a right to ask for that."

The Government attained power under most favorable auspices. Hope was general. The people were discovering how great were their mineral resources. The bright prospects of the Province were attracting immigration. Everything seemed promising. The Government had such a majority that it was independent. The people—Conservatives and Liberals—had given it the power to resist sinister influences. No Provincial Government had ever had such a majority or such an opportunity.

How Independents Were Rewarded.

For a time the Government did well. None would deprive them of their due. The Liberal press was generous. But after a time complaints were heard. It was charged that, forgetting appeals for Liberal support and the acknowledgment of generous treatment by Liberals, the spoils system was being introduced. Dismissals were numerous. Certainly some of them seemed unnecessary. The independent press began to criticize. The News was able and vigorous in its opposition to the spoils system. Some Liberals who had responded to Mr. Whitney's appeal to "good men and Christian men," and who had begun to consider him as a superior politician, were wondering if they had been deceived, and if he were of the ordinary brand. It began to appear that the Government had obtained office by false pretences, and did not differ from the ordinary Government of party prejudice.

Having been returned by a huge majority and a large Liberal support, the Government might have

postponed a general redistribution of constituencies until after the census of 1910. The unbiased observer will call the redistribution a gerrymander.

The plan of electing two members in Toronto constituencies on separate ballots was adopted, not to promote independence, but to strengthen their party lines, make sure the nomination and election of the four old members, and generally to discourage independence. Middlesex and other counties were so arranged that Liberals should not have adequate representation in the Legislature. This is gerrymander.

Gerrymandering and Hiving.

On January 24, 1905, Mr. Whitney made a public appeal for aid, and declared that should his future conduct not be approved, the people might withdraw their confidence. Does Mr. Whitney feel that he has lost public confidence? He has so arranged many constituencies by hiving Liberals that the withdrawal of Liberal confidence will not affect the standing of the parties in the Legislature. On January 23, 1905, Mr. Whitney published his "glad appreciation" of the fact that "Liberals in large numbers" supported him. In 1903, apparently with the expectation of losing Liberal support, Mr. Whitney's appreciation is expressed by hiving the Liberals. There were a grim humor in the situation did it not savor so strongly of the very ordinary commonplace and tricky politician.

Law Reform.

At a meeting held December 22nd, 1904, Mr. Whitney expressed his views on law reform. The Mail and Empire gives the following report of his remarks:—"A few years ago the Conservative party declared its policy on several questions. It favored law reform. The Divisional Court was an anomaly. The expenses had been lessened and the results of litigation lessened. There should be one final Court of Appeal for the Province, and one only. If matters continued as at present, it would soon come about that no man but the rich could go to law and get his rights in Ontario."

The first term of the Government has passed. They have been in office nearly four years, and nothing has been done for law reform. There is need of relief; the Government have failed to give it. There has been a conspicuous failure and the people are disappointed.

The Three-fifths Clause.

When the Government passed the three-fifths clause of the local option act they were guilty of reactionary legislation. Ever since Ontario became a Province the majority in a municipality has had the right to decide upon the granting of licenses. These rights were firmly established and founded upon a sense of British justice and equality. Why have the Government tampered with them? Having been returned to power by a large popular vote composed of both parties, this, of all Governments, should have trusted the people.

This country is democratic, and one man's vote should be as good as his neighbor's, and no better. In every State of the Union in which local option prevails the majority vote is considered sufficient. Under the Government of Mr. Ross, local option could be carried by a majority. This was British fair play.