Can. Pol.

MEREDITH

May 1880

Opens the Present Campaign.

AN ELOQUENT ADDRESS

To a Multitude of Toronto Electors.

HIS PLATFORM ENUNCIATED

In Language that Leaves No Doubt as to His Views,

WHICH ARE HEARTILY ENDORSED

By the Thousands of Voters Who Were Present.

A Speech that Will Live in History—Addressed to an Audience Such as Only Toronto Can Turn Out—The Pavilion Packed to Its Utmost Capacity—Hundreds Unable to Find Seating Accommodation—The Galleries Graced with the Presence of Ladies—Great Enthusiasm on the Appearance of the Leader—His Escort Composed of the Leading Conservatives of Toronto—Addresses Delivered by the Two Toronto Members—The Whole Affair a Genuine Outburst of Popular Enthusiasm—The Conflict is Now in Full Swing.

The Young Men's Liberal-Conservative Club of Toronto inaugurated the provincial campaign on Tuesday night by a mass meeting that for the numbers in attendance, the representative character of the audience, the brilliancy of the oratory and the splendid general effect produced has not been exceeded in the history of this city. The club has been an important factor in local politics ever since its inception, but it never more thoroughly demonstrated its usefulness than when it gave the opportunity of placing the gifted leader of the Ontario Opposition in communication with the loyal electors who have for so many years supported his honest and irreproachable policy and who are now under his command marching on to certain victory.

The gathering was held in the Pavilion of the Horticultural Gardens. This is the largest auditorium in the city, and with its two galleries seats some thousands of people. Last evening the doors were thrown open at 7 o'clock, and even at that early hour there were quite a number waiting admittance. By 7.30 the lower floor was well filled, and scores of ladies were assembling in the main gallery, which had been reserved for their accommodation, together with their escorts. By 8 o'clock the house was packed to the roof, and still electors eager to hear the political questions of the day discussed as only the talented representative from the Forest City can discuss them were attempting to crowd in at the doors.

At this time the view from the stage—as yet unoccupied—was one not easily to be forgotten. The great body of the hall was one dense mass of humanity, packed so closely that movement was practically impossible. Every ledge or step that could by any possibility form a resting place, either to lean or sit upon, had been seized. The rows of seats were jammed in a way that must have been, to say the least, uncomfortable. The broad aisle that runs around the house was filled with standing men, the centre aisles were fully occupied, the audience crowded up to the platform so as to incommode the reporters at their work, the doorways were jammed until further entrance was impossible, and even beyond that, as far as could be seen, was a view of the upturned faces of men who had no chance of seeing the platform, but who had hope of catching something at least of the strong, manly words that came rolling through the hall as the great leader defined the difference between right and wrong in the government of a country. The main gallery formed a horseshoe of brilliant colors, where the brightness of the ladies' toilets relieved the general sombreness of male attire, and even the steps were occupied, while up in the top gallery two policemen were so wedged in by the mass of people who had thronged up to the "gods" as a last resort that they could not have drawn a baton had they so willed. In a word, the numbers of the audience were measured only by the capability of the house to provide standing room.

While the audience was assembling, time was given to notice that the hall was splendidly decorated. The platform was a perfect bower of plants and shrubs in variegated colors, terminating at each of the wings with a towering cactus. Behind this forest of beautiful green, at the back of the platform, the loyal colors of two broad Union Jacks draped in heavy folds about a streamer bearing the inscription:

We Welcome Our Leader.

While immediately underneath was the motto:

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL.

Between the large supporting pillars of the building were hung streamers and bannerets, each bearing an inscription.

The combined effect, from a decorative point of view, was very pleasing indeed, while the inscriptions tersely expressed the views of a considerable majority of the people of Ontario.

While the audience was gathering a distinguished delegation of Conservatives had gone to the Queen's hotel to escort Mr. Meredith to the place of meeting. This delegation was composed of the officers of the different ward Conservative associations in the city and occupied some eighteen carriages. They created quite a sensation as they drove through the streets. It was but a few minutes after eight when a slight clapping of hands followed, as each eye was turned to the stage, by a perfect roar of applause greeted the appearance of the speakers of the evening. Mr. McPherson and Mr. Meredith came on the platform together, followed by the Two Clarkes, Mr. Creighton and the distinguished company mentioned below. As the leader was recognized he was greeted with a cheer whose heartiness bespoke how thoroughly he has entrenched himself in the affections of citizens of Toronto, as well as of the province generally. It was only when the chairman rose to open the meeting that quiet could be restored.

A word as to the reception of the speakers. Mr. H. E. Clarke was heartily received and was roundly cheered as he made point after point in his brief address. When the leader came forward the scene was one of the wildest enthusiasm. Ladies waved their handkerchiefs, nearly the entire audience rose, and the cheering was deafening. It lasted several minutes. Again and again while Mr. Meredith spoke this scene was repeated. The mayor was accorded a reception that, while it must have been exceedingly gratifying to himself, showed that he has not lost one whit of his popularity with the citizens of Toronto.

The chairman, Mr. W. D. McPherson, President of the Toronto Young Men's Liberal Conservative Association, briefly introduced Mr. H. E. Clarke and Mr. Meredith.

Mr. H. E. Clarke's Address.

Mr. H. E. Clarke, on coming forward, was received with loud applause. He said: I believe there is a story about the lamb who appeared before his king, and I am sure it has afforded me great pleasure to follow my leader. (Applause.) I have had the honor to represent you, and I may have the honor to represent you in the next Assembly, I think I may be permitted two or three minutes to refer to the platform laid down by Mr. Meredith. There is not a single plank in it that won't commend itself to the judgment of every patriotic man in the province of Ontario. It will bear the closest inspection. It gives equal rights to all, exclusive rights to none. That is the principle that runs through the whole platform of the local Opposition in the Provincial Parliament. That is a policy that must prevail, because it is built on truth and justice and must prevail in every constituency composed of the intelligent people of the province of Ontario. (Applause.) You must have seen that the *Globe* newspaper for the last two or three weeks has been making piteous appeals for a renewal of confidence in the Mowat Administration. They have been writing up their record, carefully concealing everything that tells against the Administration, and when it fails in everything else the *Globe* falls back on the personal character of the Attorney-General of Ontario. Now, I have not a single word to say against the Hon. Mr. Mowat. Personally I admire and esteem the man. I respect and esteem him personally; but Mr. Mowat is Prime Minister of Ontario, and as Prime Minister he is responsible for all the legislation passed through the House. He is responsible for everything to the Government. No act of that Government can be performed without his sanction, and I am bound to say I honestly believe many of the acts of that Government have been performed without Mr. Mowat's approbation. He is not the strongest man in his own Cabinet. (Applause.) He has a colleague sitting alongside of him who can boast that he has 60,000 of a solid vote at his back, and that 60,000 of a solid vote in this Protestant province of Ontario! (Applause.) Now, we may just as well face this thing, because we have been facing it for a considerable time. It is clear it is staring us in the face, and we must stare it in the face, we must look back at it. (Applause.) If you look up the figures at the last provincial election you will find that the Conservative Opposition had a majority of about 30,000 Protestant voters in the province of Ontario, but Mr. Mowat had a majority of 40,000 of the Roman Catholics, and that difference gave him the balance of power. Mr. Mowat sits in his seat to-day at the bidding and with the support only of this 60,000 of a solid vote. That is the thing we have to stare in the face at the present time. We had 30,000 of a Protestant majority. I am not saying a word against our fellow citizens of the Roman Catholic persuasion, but if they choose to band themselves together in order to support a policy or a party then I think Protestants have just as good a right to band themselves together. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) I am glad to see you agree with me in that. We had 30,000 of a majority, but I trust on this occasion they will amount to 100,000—to the Conservative candidates, and if they do then good-bye to Mr. Mowat—(loud cheers)—that will good-bye to the rule of the hierarchy—(hear, hear)—good-bye to tampering with our public schools and good-bye to a good many other things that we ought to have said farewell to long ago. (Loud applause.) After referring to the method adopted by Mr. Mowat to secure a representative for himself in Toronto, Mr. Clarke continued: Thus Toronto has only one vote, whereas she should have five or six representatives. (Cheers.) Is that honest government? (Cries of "No, no.") Under this system there is nothing to prevent the Government of the day from electing all their followers by Act of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing whatever to prevent that. They can elect them without any reference to the people. In this way we are stepping towards the worst form of government that was ever invented, that of the French revolutionary form of government, where the Assembly declared themselves elected in perpetuity. What is the difference between a parliament electing themselves in perpetuity and a parliament electing a candidate who shall represent the minority by Act of Parliament only? The Act of Mr. Mowat has simply been to destroy the influence of the majority of the people of this city. (Hear, hear.) Now, it is that policy that we are thoroughly opposed to. I am not going to discuss it, because we will have other opportunities during the campaign of discussing these and other questions. It would be bad taste, indeed, seeing that we are all assembled here to hear Mr. Meredith, if I were to take up any more of your time. Mr. Meredith's platform is going to change all that, and is going to give us an honest Government. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Meredith's position is equality for everyone, and equal rights for everyone, with no special favor for anyone or for any party in the state. (Applause.) These are things that will all be discussed by-and-bye. We have been singing during the last week, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Mowat's hour has come. Now, Mr. Meredith's hour has come. We know the hour has come, and we know the man. Both the hour and the man have come, and we are now ready to hear Mr. Meredith. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

Mr. Meredith's Address.

Mr. Meredith on coming forward was received with deafening applause. After the long outburst of enthusiasm had subsided the leader spoke as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—I am indeed grateful for the warm welcome which you have given me upon this my first appearance before an audience of the city of Toronto assembled upon the eve of an election. And I may say to you that never in the course of my political experience, which extends now over a period of eighteen years, have I risen to address an audience with a greater sense of the responsibility that rested upon me, and of the necessity of my discharging my duty properly, fearlessly and justly in the face of the people. (Applause.) I know, Mr. Chairman, that the burning questions of the day are delicate questions. I know that they are questions with regard to which people who have been members of the Conservative party, who are to-day members of the Conservative party, are extremely sensitive upon. Therefore, in endeavoring to speak upon them to-night, I hope that no word that I shall utter will give offence to the sensibilities or the religious convictions of any man, no matter what his faith may be. (Applause.) It would, Mr. Chairman, be altogether out of the question that I should to-night enter upon an exhaustive review of questions which are to be presented for the consideration of the electors of the province of Ontario in the approaching elections. But it does seem to me that, at the expense perhaps of wearying you, it is my duty to go over them as briefly as I can before I reach those questions which are to my mind the burning questions in connection with the elections—those questions of general policy upon which we are at issue with the Government of Mr. Mowat. The Government of Mr. Mowat has now been in power for some seventeen or eighteen years in this province of Ontario, and it is again appealing to the electors of the province for a renewal of their confidence, and I perceive from the observations which are made in the press supporting the Government of Mr. Mowat and by those advocating his cause throughout the country that they challenge criticism upon the financial record of the Government, upon its legislation and upon its administrative actions, and with regard to these three branches I shall endeavor to say a few brief words, and I will ask your attention to the consideration of these topics. Now, I think that if I come to compare the Administration of the Hon. Oliver Mowat with any Administration in this country the fair comparison to make is with the Administration that preceded him in the province of Ontario, led by Hon. Sandfield Macdonald; not an entirely Conservative Government, but a Government largely Conservative in its essential features. Now, I see that the people are beginning to understand day by day what an excellent Government that was which first ruled the destinies of the province of Ontario. (Applause.) I see also that Mr. Mowat and those who speak for his Government talk, and any man may talk, with pride of the progress of the province of Ontario during the last eighteen years; they talk of the magnificent institutions, which speak to the humanitarian of the great charity and benevolence of the people of the province; of the magnificent drainage which has made the great western portion of the province which years ago was but a wilderness and swamp, many parts of it now are some of the finest portions of Ontario; they speak about the magnificent railway system which interlocks and interlaces the whole of the province of Ontario. Mr. Mowat's supporters speak with pride of these things, and point to them as something of their accomplishment. But I say that the man to whom credit is to be given is the man who inaugurated and set on foot this great scheme, the master mind who put them on foot, and upon whose footsteps Hon. Oliver Mowat has followed, the man who now lies silent in his grave, and who was driven from power by the Government which followed him, and which is now in power. I ask, sir, to compare the economical record of that Government with the Government of to-day. The accumulated savings for the four years while they had been in office was $4,000,000, almost all of which has been spent and almost nothing left in the treasury by the Government who succeeded him. Now, I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to enter into anything like a review of the financial situation of the province of Ontario.

Administration of the Crown Lands.

I desire now to say a word or two with regard to the Crown Lands Department and its administration. You are aware that the Crown Lands Department is one of the revenue-producing sources of Ontario. Now, one of the matters on which the Conservative Opposition has taken issue with the Government of Mr. Mowat is with regard to the control of these timber limits. We maintain the doctrine of responsibility of Government. You all know the members of that Parliament are the representatives of the people; yet, sir, the Government of Mr. Mowat has persistently kept the right of selling these lands without going down to the Legislature and asking their consent to the placing of these timber limits upon the market. We have stated that this was not in accordance with true principle, and that the Government of the day, or any Government, was bound to come down as the people's representatives and ask them before they part with the timber limits and place them upon the market. Why, sir, the administration of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald thought it was not in the public interest that we should dispose of more of these limits, and what was the first act when Mr. Blake's Government came into power but to place five thousand square miles upon the market and to dispose of the timber standing upon this 5,000 square miles, and, sir, what was the result in regard to that sale? Instead of there being a demand for the timber that was there, for years and years not an axe was put in a single stick of the timber that was there, and the sales that were made in 1885 of lots which the purchasers at that sale in 1872 refused to take evidenced the enormous sum that the province of Ontario had lost by placing these upon the market. Instead of this advance passing into the coffers of Ontario it passed into the hands of the owners of these timber limits. Why, a return was brought down to the House of the sale, as I have mentioned to you, of some of these limits which the purchasers had refused to take at the sale in 1872, and which, therefore, may be taken to be the very worst of the lot, and one of these timber limits, 36 miles in extent (I am giving you the highest price), was sold for $70 a mile in 1872 and sold in 1885 for $900 a square mile. (Cheers.) These matters were never brought prominently before the public, who had no direct and immediate control through their representatives of the territorial revenues of Ontario. We on the Opposition have been very anxious that the province should take stock of their timber. Suppose anyone engaged in a timber operation would say "I am going to spend from year to year beyond my income and out of my revenue, but will take no stock of my resources." This I am prepared to say any intelligent business man would condemn. Well, this is the way Mr. Mowat has been going on. The Opposition proposed that a commission should be appointed to investigate and look into the timber resources of the province. That commission was voted down. The Government refused to permit that enquiry, although they granted a mining commission which was in a measure due to the result of the Opposition's request in connection with the timber enquiry. The Crown Land Commissioner says there are $136,000,000 belonging to Ontario. He cannot vouch for that statement, and I claim that we should insist upon an enquiry and examination into what the assets of the province are. The gentlemen who are supporting Mr. Mowat bring forward the idea that the timber policy of Ontario compares favorably with that in Ottawa. I say this is not the way in which this question should be dealt with. We have in Ontario settled upon certain ways to dispose of our timber, and it is idle to make any comparison with what is done at Ottawa and what is done here, and the electors ought not to be led away by a determination of what is done at Ottawa. My sphere is within provincial politics and I am not here to criticise any action of the Dominion Government, which should be properly dealt with there by the proper authorities. We are here concerned with the province of Ontario, and it behooves you to look at in that way.

Laws Placed on Statute Book.

Credit is taken by the Government in regard to the laws they have placed on the statute book. No doubt they are entitled to a certain amount of credit for what they have done, but I claim the Opposition is entitled to an equal amount of credit for the laws which stand on the statute book. It has been admitted on the floor of the House by fair criticism that the Opposition merited this. There is some legislation we do not claim credit for. If there is a subject upon which we would expect improved legislation it is in regard to the purity of elections. The Reformers say their party is the party of purity. (Laughter.) I am dealing with the Mowat Government. Since I have been a member of the Provincial Assembly, in 1872, four or five men were relieved of their disqualification, and again Dr Dowling was relieved at the instance of Mr. Mowat. In connection with the trial of Dr. Dowling, I want to read you a letter from the Attorney-General. Now, on the 15th March, 1883, Mr. Mowat writes as follows to Mr. John A. Harvey:

MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 12th March. From what you say of your services to the Liberal party you certainly are entitled to every consideration. As your letter is marked private I cannot without your permission communicate its contents to Dr. Dowling. The appointment must be made on his recommendation though his nominee must be a fit person. With regard to your taking steps to unseat him, do not forget that by unseating Dr. Dowling, should this be in your power, you accomplish something much more important, and that is you do an injury to the cause which you have so long supported. I have not yet seen the copy of the Pembroke *Observer* which you mention in your P.S. as having sent me. O. MOWAT.

But that was not the last communication. On the 2nd April he wrote as follows:

MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 26th, which partly through absence from the city and partly from pressure of business I have not before acknowledged. It is really impossible to deal with the inspectorship except through Dr. Dowling. I am extremely sorry for the trouble that has arisen about it. I think it probable that I may have before long an opportunity of recognizing your continued services (as I have learned from you) to the party, though there is no opening in any of the departments just now. I hope that in the general interest you will do what you can to defeat the petition, which I see has been filed, and thereby afford another proof of your good feeling towards us.

Yours truly, O. MOWAT.

John A. Harvey, Esq., Renfrew, Ont.

I want to call your attention to the last words in this letter—"I hope in the general interest you will do what you can to defeat the petition which has been filed, thereby affording another proof of your good feeling towards us." (Laughter and cheers.) Here was the Attorney-General writing to a man who had declared that he had ground upon which a member should be unseated and disqualified. We have the Attorney-General appealing to this man not to press this petition, no matter if the law was not vindicated, lest it might hurt the Liberal party. So you see a good man can sometimes go a little astray. (Cheers.) Another fault I find with regard to

This Election Law

is that during the last two sessions Mr. Whitney, one of the members from the eastern portion of the province—from the county of Dundas—in order to secure purity at elections, in order to put down the debased, corrupt practice of purchasing men's votes—and I venture to think no more debased, corrupt, no more abominable thing can be spoken of than the purchasing or trafficking in the vote of the elector. (Hear, hear.) In order to put down that kind of thing, I say, he introduced last session and the session before a bill giving judges the power to impose imprisonment upon those who were guilty of these offences—indeed, I should say, to impose imprisonment as well as a fine. And what he said was that in this country, bordering on the United States, with only the river St. Lawrence between us and the American territory, the Americans came over the river and corrupted the electors and the constituencies, and Canadian voters were led to vote by designing men. He further said that we could not have pure elections unless, besides the power to convict by fine, there was the power to punish the party engaged in buying a vote as well as the voter who engaged in selling by imprisonment. And what would you reasonably expect Mr. Mowat to do in such a case? Do you not think he should have reasonably been expected to pass such a measure? No! Instead of doing that he and his supporters voted it down on both occasions and Mr. Whitney was unable to put it on the statute book as one of the laws of the land. I say, then, this is a matter which makes Mr. Mowat worthy of the condemnation of the whole electorate of the province. Now, Mr. Chairman, to the Reformers of this country, I have to give due largely the credit of having given to this province municipal institutions, and I think when they gave to the province municipal institutions they gave it one of the greatest boons that could be conferred on a free community—(applause)—because when I look I think there can be no better means of educating our people—our democratic people—to the high responsibility of citizenship and governing themselves than by bringing the power as near as possible to the people, as in the school districts and as in the municipal communities as they are formed throughout the country. And it seems to me the proper policy in this country ought to be to

Extend as Far as Possible

the power to these municipal bodies. (Applause.) But, instead of doing that, the whole policy of the Government of the day has been to withdraw this power from the municipalities and to throw doubt upon the advisability of extending these powers in the direction which, I say, they ought to be extended; and one of the offences which I charge against the Government is that it has been stretching out its hands in all directions, centralizing power and bringing it into use to the advantage of the party in power for the time being. I took a little memorandum within the last day or so of what they did within a short time with regard to one, or two, or three classes of offices, in order to show you the extent to which this system, centered in the Government, is used, and to show you that such power in the public interest ought not to be in their hands. They have taken into their hands the appointment of 321 Division Court clerks and 347 Division Court bailiffs, making a total of 668 in all. These officers draw salaries or fees varying from $50 to $2,500 or $3,000 per year each. Then they have appointed 279 license commissioners, 52 jailers and other officers, making a total of 1,095 appointees, to say nothing of police magistrates and the army of officials in connection with the departments, particularly the Crown Lands Department. Now, with regard to this matter of the appointment to offices, I say it is one of the evils of the present day the number of young men who are looking out for Government offices. There should be as few of these offices in any Government's hands as possible. It is not well in a country like ours that the Government of the day should be possessed of the enormous patronage that from time to time the Government of Mr. Mowat is gathering to itself. When we come to discuss these questions let us see whether the Government discussed them on the grounds of public interest. And in this connection let me mention

Two Instances

familiar to those present, because they affect the city of Toronto the taxpayers of Toronto. We have adopted the principle that where the fees payable to an officer exceed a certain sum beyond a reasonable remuneration the surplus should be given back to the public chest. There was one man holding the office of sheriff of Toronto who received fees to the amount of about $16,000 per year, but instead of giving back the surplus fees to the city Mr. Mowat divided this office into two, so as to lengthen his list of patronage. No, I am not finding fault with Mr. Mowat's son, who holds the office of sheriff. (Laughter and applause.) I think the persons who formed the deputation that proposed to Mr. Mowat to appoint his son were the most grievously disappointed, seeing that instead of finding him standing like adamant against such a course, he graciously accepted the position on behalf of his son. (Laughter.)

Toronto Registry Office.

Then, Mr. Chairman, another question is the question of the registry office of Toronto. There is another case of this kind. What did this Government do? Instead of increasing the amount which should go to Toronto, they said, "Here is a case in which it is our right to provide for one of our friends." I have not a word to say as to the friend they have provided for. He has done yeoman work for his party, but I hope he will cease to do any more yeoman service, and attend to the duties of his office. (Laughter.) However, instead of the Government increasing the amount that should go to the city they divided the office and made Peter Ryan a second registrar. And these two gentlemen, I believe, sit in the same office and take in the money instead of the surplus passing into the hands of the city of Toronto. (Hear, hear.) I come now to the question of

The License Law.

I see one of those mottos on the wall, which the Young Conservative Association has placed there—"Non-partisan License System." I am glad to see that there, because I think that one of the most grievous sins of the Administration of the day is their administration of the liquor license system in this province. (Cheers.) Now, Mr. Mowat and his friends throughout have been persistently saying that they took this upon themselves reluctantly, that they did not want to do it, that petitions came in from the temperance people of the country pressing upon them to take control of the license system or they would not have done so. Members of the House had heard this statement so often that by the almost thought this was so, until my friend Mr. Creighton, who is somewhat of a doubting Thomas, says: "This does not strike me as being a fact." He hunted up the petitions, and he produced them last session, and confronted them with the petitions, and nothing of the sort was voiced in those petitions. (Applause.) You will recollect, gentlemen, that at the time of the appointment of the commissioners in the first place, Mr. Mowat promised, in order that the thing should be perfectly fair and just, that one of these commissioners should be appointed from the Conservative party. He had nothing to conceal; he was going to be perfectly fair. That is the way your liberties are taken away—fair professions and perhaps honest practises for a little while, and the true thing is ultimately carried out. He did appoint a few Conservatives on the boards, but he did not do it long, and ultimately there were none but the hottest Reformers to be found on these boards. What was the excuse? Conservatives could not be found to carry out the law, and the Administration were bound to have persons in sympathy with them to carry out the law. I say that was a foul slander upon the Conservative temperance people of this country. Now then, you have had some experience of the working of this system in Toronto. I want to know whether you think it works fairly. I want to know whether you think it is an honest system, or whether it is not an administration to a large extent in the interest of the party of the day. (Cries of "Yes, yes.") The public press denounced it. When we came into the House one does not like to act simply upon the unsupported statement of the newspapers, but with regard to these matters with which the newspapers were dealing, it is pretty difficult for one of these hotelkeepers, because his business depends upon getting his license, to open his mouth and state what he knows about these things. I believe the case will be on the 5th of June, when you sweep out this Government—(loud cheers)—that there shall be such an opening of the mouths of these men that there shall be stories told enough almost to make the walls of this house tumble down. (Cheers.) Now it is stated, perhaps with some truth, that these hotel keepers have to pay through the nose, no matter what their political complexions may be, for the election funds of the Reform party, and other little side shows of that kind for the Government of the day. I don't wonder, therefore, that Mr. Mowat and his friends hang to this licensing system if it is doing all that for them, as well as enabling them to control to a considerable extent the people in the business. I don't wonder at their hanging on to it. (Hear, hear.) Now, we have fortunately under oath the examination of a prominent brewer in connection with this matter. We have his statement. It has been in print, and no doubt this audience, a reading audience, have seen it. He swore upon his oath that in a Dominion election he went around with Mr. Mackenzie, a license inspector, to the tavern-keepers of Hamilton for the purpose of influencing them. Mackenzie, the license inspector, and the brewer did not go to anybody else but the hotelkeepers. He advised them to vote for the Reform candidate, because it was in the interest of the liquor dealers to be on the side of the Mowat Government. Now, I ask you, gentlemen, why would it be to the interest of the liquor dealers to be on the side of the Mowat Government, unless the Mowat Government could improperly refuse them what they ought to get, or improperly give them what they ought not to have. This is a fair and legitimate conclusion to that statement. What we say in regard to that matter is that we have confidence in the people. We say we do not want these license commissioners appointed on the nomination of the Government candidate for the constituency, whether he is elected or defeated. That is just the way it is done. Now, let us illustrate that. Here in Toronto you have a gentleman elected by Act of Parliament representing the minority of the citizens of Toronto, a respectable minority likely. Who appoints the license commissioners for Toronto? John Leys, the minority representative for the city of Toronto. (Loud laughter and applause.) Now, what is the policy that the Opposition propose? We say in cities and towns separated from counties that three commissioners shall be elected directly by the people; then you would have the very best men in the community. You would have no party heelers. I don't want to say anything to hurt the feelings of anybody who has occupied the position of a license commissioner in Toronto. But, take these men from the first time appointed until now, with perhaps two or three spasmodic virtuous exceptions on the eve of an election, and how many of them would be elected by the city of Toronto? (Cries of "None," "None of them.") I want to know how many of them would be elected that way to administer this important branch of the public service. Then we say in other portions of the country, because there are difficulties in having a direct popular vote with regard to them, the commissioners should be appointed by the county councils. Some say, "Oh, but these county councils would be just as partisan as the Government of the day." I admit that there is a certain amount of partisanship in the county councils, but it is not entirely partisan as under the present system. The evil now is that in the long run the whole of the traffic will be at the mercy of the Government of the country, and sometimes the Government of the country, at the mercy of this traffic, which, by combined force, can demand concessions which are not in the public interest. (Applause.) Therefore I hold that there ought to be decentralization in regard to this system and that each locality should have the appointment in that locality of men whom they have confidence in to administer this important branch of the public service. (Applause.) That is one question upon which, if we have the opportunity of doing so, we intend to place a law on the statute book of the province of Ontario. (Applause.) But some temperance people who have been led away on this question say you are restoring to the municipalities the power of controlling the traffic and they point back to the time that the traffic was controlled by the municipalities, when the evil of intemperance more widely existed and claim that the law was not as much in the public interest as it is now. But these gentlemen forget that one great feature of the Crooks Act, the best feature of it, which limits the number of licenses to be granted in each community, makes matters different now so that it would not be as it was before when a commission chose to grant as many licenses as they pleased. And is nothing to be said about the great advance in the temperance sentiment of this community during the last fifteen or sixteen years? I am glad to say that an immense wave of temperance has swept throughout the country during the last eighteen years, that there has been a great decrease in the drinking habits of the community—(applause)—and that to that is due the increased and improved condition, and which is increasing and improving throughout the province of Ontario, and because whatever opinions men may have upon the license system or prohibition everybody must agree that to lessen the amount of drinking in the community and make the people more temperate must be eminently in the general interest, and should be promoted by any honest citizen. (Applause.) I come now, Mr. Chairman, to say a word or two to you in regard to

The Education Department.

I think, sir, that the times are beginning to satisfy most people that we made a huge mistake when we put a political head in control of the Education Department. (Loud applause.) I know that the great weight of Dr. Ryerson's name is given to the change made, but those who have followed the history of the subject must have seen that Dr. Ryerson did not always entertain that view, and it was with great reluctance in the declining years of his life he expressed that opinion. But, whatever views Dr. Ryerson might have entertained, and however great Dr. Ryerson's experience might have been, I venture to say that the House was mistaken and that it was a great pity when that change was made. If there is one thing more than another that ought to be kept high above ordinary political strife it is the education of our children. (Applause.) I do not sympathize with those who are always talking about "the mad of politics"; I do not sympathize with those who live in the higher atmosphere of the social and moral plane, who are always sneering at those engaged in political life. (Applause.) This is an every-day business world, and in the battle of political life the liberties of the people are fought out and the government of the country carried on. The people attend to these things, and I say belittle it never—(loud applause)—but, however pure you make politics, as long as men are men, and as long as men will become partisan, so long will it be dangerous to bring the education of the children within the arena of political strife. Let me ask any intelligent, honest, fair-minded man in this province to answer me this question: Does he not believe that if the Government, having a responsible Minister at its head, is committed to a particular line of policy that Government's supporters in the House will not defend its policy more readily so as to strengthen the Government's hands? So, on the other side, the men opposed to it are more likely to attack the Government than they would be if the department were non-partisan. Therefore, I say that the system which is the best for the country is the system which has not a political chief at the head of the department, but a non-political head existing, as in the old system, with some kind of a council of public instruction comprising the most experienced educationists in the country. (Applause.) That system is the system we advocate, the system which I think is in the best interest of the people of the country. I want to point out this, that every one of those amendments to the separate school law has been made since the Education Department was presided over by a political head. (Applause.) I don't say whether that is a coincidence or a consequence of this matter which I have been speaking to you upon, but I simply wish to point out to you this fact, that every one of the changes made in the separate school law has been made since a responsible Minister was placed at the head of the department. On the occasion of my London address a few months ago, I referred to the increase in recent years which has taken place in the number of the separate schools of the province, and that this increase has also taken place since, and began when a political head was placed in control of the Education Department. I don't say that the argument is conclusive, but the circumstance is worthy of consideration.

The French Schools.

I now come to a question upon which I desire to speak with the utmost frankness. I come to the question referred to in this motto before me, "English Schools in Ontario." (Loud applause.) I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there never can be greatness in this Dominion, composed of different races and different nationalities, if we are constantly quarreling one with the other. I recognize that our French-Canadian fellow-citizens are in the main loyal to this great Dominion and to the Mother Land; I am willing to testify to the services rendered by them to Canada and the Mother Land in regard to the preservation of this glorious Canada as a part of the dominions of the Mother Land; I am willing to recognize the beauty of the French language; I am willing to recognize it as one of the most beautiful languages on the face of the earth; but at the same time I say in this English province of Ontario we are bound to have our schools English schools. (Loud applause.) I am not going to say anything about French as it exists in the province of Quebec. By the law of the land the French language exists there, but that has nothing to do with Ontario, and I am talking about Ontario. I say that in Ontario it is the fundamental duty of the people to see that their schools are made English schools at once. (Loud applause.) We are willing in this land to receive foreigners from every land; from old France, from Germany, Switzerland and every country under the sun; we tell them they will find this country the finest in the world, that they will have free homes and free institutions, but we say to them, you must come here and be obedient to the laws, you must come here and learn our language. (Applause.) On these conditions we tell them that we are ready to receive them. Now, there is a peculiar condition of things with regard to French in the eastern part of the province of Ontario. We have upon one side of us the province of Quebec with one of her counties crossing the Ottawa river and forming a wedge in the province of Ontario. Alongside of that has grown a settlement mainly of French people. We cannot permit that portion of the province of Ontario to be practically a part of the province of Quebec. While we welcome these French-Canadians within our borders we must say to them, "When you come in make your schools English and become English-speaking citizens of the province of Ontario." I do not mean to say that they shall forget their mother tongue, but I do say that in the schools which they attend the language shall be the language of the public schools of Ontario. That is the more important in view of the position taken by a section of the province of Quebec. We have had the declaration made by a leading public man of the province of Quebec that they intended to establish upon this continent a French and Roman Catholic nation, and that they are going by a peaceful conquest ultimately to have Ontario.

A Voice—Never.

I do not mean to say that there is any danger of the people of Ontario allowing that to be done, but I do say that when you find a portion of our people holding to a view of that kind, it is of the utmost importance to see that when they come within the province of Ontario they should conform to our laws and the language of English schools in that province. (Cheers.) I do not blame the Government for the state of things they found existing there in the first instance. Unfortunately, in years gone by it was permitted that the French language should be the language of these schools.

What I Do Blame the Government for

is that, when their attention was called to the fact, they denied the state of things that was there, and persisted in their denial until they were forced to change it. The public press had in the first place, with that enterprise which characterizes them, gone down into the counties of Prescott and Russell, and they published the state of things that existed there. Mr. Craig had his attention called to the matter. He was a thoughtful man, a Christian man and a credit to the province of Ontario, and my only regret is that he may not have a seat in the coming House. Mr. Craig called attention to the state of things and made a speech in the House. Mr. Ross rose, following him, and instead of accepting Mr. Craig's statements and the evidence which he produced, met him by the positive denial of that state of things which Mr. Craig said was existing in these counties. He said the condition of these schools was fair. The whole matter would have passed off there and then with nothing more being done, because I am bound to admit that what Mr. McCarthy and others said is probably true, that the Government would have done nothing had not public sentiment been worked up. Then this commission was appointed to go down and examine those schools. That commission was appointed from the friends of the Government of the day. I do not mean to say that the commissioners wilfully misstated anything, but I do say that the commissioners went there with the intention of not injuring the Government any more than was absolutely necessary by the investigation they made and the report they made to the public. What was in that report? What did it indicate? It indicated that in many of the schools the teachers were wholly incompetent to teach a word of English, that in many of the schools the teaching of English was practically nil, that in many of the schools—the public schools of the province bear in mind—books containing religious education in the Roman Catholic faith were in use, although objected to by the parents of Protestant children attending these schools, and there were also put in evidence the facts that some religious emblems peculiar to the Roman Catholic faith were found in these schools. I ask, was that a creditable thing in the province of Ontario, and should that state of things exist in our public schools? It seems to me it was not, and it was Mr. Ross' duty—who is paid a reasonable salary as a public servant to perform these high duties—to have himself gone down and made an examination, and see how matters stood, and I venture to say if he had done so he would not have answered Mr. Craig as he did. Why, sir, the very book which Mr. Craig produced in the House, which was denied by Mr. Ross as having been used in the schools, was reported upon by the commissioners as having been used to a considerable extent in the schools, and reported as a book that ought to be sent out from the schools at once. And more than that. In the report, which I have now in my hand, it is stated that Mr. Ross had received from his own inspector—Mr. Summerby—a list of the books in use, and this Syllabaire des Ecoles Chretiennes was one of the very books used. Yet in face of that document Mr. Ross hooted Mr. Craig's statement and denied it in toto, and as I said before there would have been no enquiry had it not been that public feeling was greatly aroused. Then what did Mr. Mowat say last session when this matter was being discussed in the House? He said the report of these commissioners brought out nothing that was not known to the Government. If what this commissioners' report contains was known to the Government, then that in itself, I say, is sufficient to induce the people of the province to say that they are no longer worthy of the confidence of the people. (Cheers.) To bring this matter to a point what did the Opposition do? A bill was introduced last session—I have it here—by Mr. Craig for the purpose of dealing with this subject, and unless I tire you by doing it, I should like to mention what some of the principal features of this bill are. (Cries of "No, no" and "Go on.") The first section of the bill provides that English shall be the language of every public and separate school in this province. (Loud and prolonged cheers.) It then provided that except as to section 7 no other language than the English language shall be taught in any public or separate school in the province. It then provided that no teacher should be employed or permitted to teach in any public or separate school in this province unless capable of speaking the English language and conducting the proceedings of the school according to the programme of studies in the English language. It provided that if a child could not receive instruction in English it may be permissible for the teacher to instruct him in the tongue he could understand. That was to meet the case of a little French child who goes to school not knowing a word of English and who, it is contended, cannot be taught in any other way. Perhaps there is some force in that, and it was intended to meet that plea in the provision I have referred to in this bill. There is, however, a school of languages, which is making some progress, which does not believe in teaching through the language known by the pupil, but instead they take an object and instruct the pupil in the word of the particular language which stands for the particular object. In the face of this system I don't think the objection is quite as strong as some of the gentlemen who urged it said it was. Then, in order to see that this law was enforced or carried out, it was provided that it should be the duty of the school inspector to report once in every six months upon every school under his charge in which any other than the English is taught, and in such report to certify as to whether the provisions of this Act were complied with, and any violations thereof which had taken place, and also to report at least 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. Then it was also provided that the teacher who should be guilty of a wilful violation of the provisions of the Act should be no longer a teacher in any public or separate school of this province. This was a drastic proposition, but it was necessary to have the law properly and fairly carried out. It went on to provide:

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.

You will see there that the teaching in a foreign tongue was to be then as a temporary means in those places where it was then being taught, and was limited to one hour per day. Then it was provided, if it was found by the report of the inspector that the provisions of this Act were not in good faith in any school being carried out, then that exception which I have read should no longer apply to that school. I ask you, gentlemen, was that not a fair bill? Is there any provision in that bill unjust to any class of the community? (Cries of "No.") Well, that bill was voted down by the Government of the day. That bill, it was said, should not become law, and, as I said, it was voted down. What is Mr. Ross' excuse for all this? What did he say? He says: "Two years before any announcement was made about this matter I had commenced to deal with the question, and already had made some prov

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.