

THE TORY
MANIFESTO
IN 1883

LP
F
5012

1883

K6

6

QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



KINGSTON, ONTARIO
CANADA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

$\frac{L}{F5012}$ 1883 K6

THE TORY MANIFESTO IN 1883

“FACTS FOR IRISH ELECTORS.”

PROOF OF ITS AUTHENTICITY.

Affidavit of the Author.

The following is a copy of the affidavit of M. W. Kirwan, setting forth that the pamphlet called “Facts for Irish Electors” was prepared and revised by W. R. Meredith, Sir John Macdonald and C. W. Bunting, prior to the General Election of 1883, wherein an earnest appeal was made to the Irish Catholic Electors to support Conservative candidates on account of the liberality of the leader of the Opposition, and alleging that they should oppose the Mowat Government on account of their ultra-Protestant leaning.*

Affidavit of M. W. Kirwan.

“I, the undersigned M. W. Kirwan, of the City of Quebec, and presently in the City of Montreal, solemnly affirm as follows:

“I am a journalist.

“When in the City of Toronto in the year 1882, I was shown a letter from Sir John Macdonald, Prime Minister of Canada, addressed to a prominent Conservative friend of mine, urging the desirability of securing my services as a writer of campaign literature for the Conservative party during the approaching Ontario Provincial Elections.

“The letter was an autograph one.

“I was accordingly engaged by H. H. Smith, of Peterborough the organizer of the Conservative party for Ontario.

“My salary was to be \$100 a month. The understanding was that I should **assist the Conservative party by special appeals to the Irish Catholic Electors.**

“Sir John Macdonald and **Mr. Meredith**, the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, were aware of the agreement.

“I accordingly began to write an appeal to the Irish Catholics of Ontario.

*Copies of “Facts for Irish Electors” can be procured from W. T. B. Preston, General Secretary Reform Association, Toronto.

"I wrote the sheet "**Facts for the Irish Catholic Electors**," extracts from which have recently appeared in the *Globe*, of Toronto.

"While I was preparing it, I had, occasionally, to **make inquiries as to the nature and scope of my work from Mr. Meredith**, to whom I had *always easy access*.

"This was during the session of the Ontario Legislature, and as my researches were made in the Parliamentary Library, it was there that *my consultations with Mr. Meredith* generally took place.

"When the sheet, "**Facts for the Irish Catholic Electors**," was completed, I *submitted a proof to Mr. Meredith* in his private room in the Queen's Hotel, and I showed a proof to Mr. Bunting in his private office in The *Mail Buildings*.

"He received the proof as if expecting it, and expressed no surprise.

"I also sent a proof to Sir John Macdonald, under cover, marked 'private and confidential.' It was returned to me with several marginal corrections in Sir John's handwriting. I have a distinct recollection of some of the corrections made by Sir John Macdonald. He mentioned the names of some Irish Catholics who had been appointed by him to positions of emolument and trust. These corrections by Sir John were embodied in the sheet and published with it.

"I have also a distinct recollection of Mr. Bunting saying that the sheet would do good among the Irish Catholics, or words to that effect.

"I remember, too, that **Mr. Meredith raised no objections** to any statement made in the said sheet after reading the proof. He smiled **approvingly**, and said: 'it would do,' or something similar to that.

"I am, too, the author of the circular containing the following letter and questions:—

(Private and confidential.)

Toronto, Jan. 7, 1883.

Dear Sir,—A letter will be forwarded to you in a day or so making inquiries with reference to the Catholic vote in your riding.

Be good enough to answer the questions and forward your reply without delay to H. H. Smith, Esq., Peterboro'.

Yours faithfully,————

QUESTIONS.

1. About how many Catholic electors are there in your riding?
2. About how many of them voted for the Conservative candidate the last election?

3. About how many voted for the Reformer ?
4. About how many were there who did not vote at all ?
5. Who are the Catholic clergymen in the riding ?
6. How did they vote ?
7. Did they take an active part in the contest, and if so, how ?
8. What reasons, if any, do the Catholic electors give for supporting Mr. Mowat ?
9. Have you any suggestions to make as to the best means of putting the Conservative cause fairly before the Catholic electors ?
10. Give the names of a few of the most influential Catholics in your riding ?
11. Send a complete list of the Catholic electors in your riding, with names and addresses.
12. Oblige by returning this list *at once*, and the reply to question *eleven*, as soon as possible.
13. Name of riding.

“These questions were also submitted to Mr. Meredith and approved by him. *It was*, to the best of my recollection, *on his suggestion* that the answers were directed to be sent to H. H. Smith, of Peterborough, although said circulars were mailed by me from Toronto. My salary was regularly paid by Mr. Smith during this time, and for several months while I was canvassing and addressing meetings of the Irish Catholic electors of Ontario.

“And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty’s reign, entitled ‘An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra judicial oaths.’

“Solemnly affirmed before me at Montreal,
on this fourth day of December, A.D. 1886.

W. A. WEIR,

A Commissioner in Quebec for receiving affidavits for Ontario.

181 St. James St., Montreal.

} M. W. KIRWAN.”

A NEW PARTY.

There is another interesting document to hand, which also, in a very striking manner, shows the treachery of its promoters. It deserves a place beside the formulas of the “New Party” and the “Equal Rights Party,” both of which, though professing entire independence of the existing parties, and opposition to both, and though apparently not actuated by common motives and interests, seem to be at one in the opinion that the Mowat Government should be turned out because Sir John Macdonald refused to disallow the Jesuit Act! The late election in West Lambton, and projected ones in the coming contest, prove this

fact beyond much controversy. But here is an organization which wants to do the same thing under a different name and line. It calls itself by the pretentious name of "The Ontario Educational Reform Party." The fact that the notorious Big Push Wilkinson, of the recent "Brood of brawling bribers," is one of the organizers and leading lights of this organization will not secure for its proposals the confidence and support of the good men and true to whom it appeals. Here is the scheme as outlined by the Secretary of the organization in letters addressed to prominent electors throughout the Province, or which the following is a copy:—

TORONTO, 9th August, '89.

"DEAR SIR,—I have been instructed to write to you by our party.

"We have formed a party upon the enclosed platform, to be known as the Ontario Educational Reform Party. The party is to work exclusively in Provincial politics. The purposes are:—

"(1) To neutralise the Catholic solid vote in the Legislature, and thus disenthral any party from its control and influence.

"(2) To reform the school laws in conformity with the platform.

"The mode of accomplishing this is to run independent candidates in about forty ridings in which Mr. Meredith's party cannot win, thus securing, say, half that number of seats from Mr. Mowat's side, and so secure the balance of power between the two parties, and be able to dictate terms to them. By not opposing Mr. Meredith in the ridings that he can carry we can get a solid Conservative vote, and our platform will bring us enough ultra-Protestants to win the election.

"There is no advantage to us in winning from Mr. Meredith, as his is the smaller side, and the more he gets, the less we will need to get to give us the balance of power.

"The party is not seeking for power or to reform a Government, but only to become the balance of power.

"We find that you stand in such position in your riding of ——— that if you were to name the candidate on this platform you could win easily and without a peradventure. You could get the solid Conservative vote, for they would not bring out a candidate, and you would get your personal friends, Reformers, and the ultra-Protestants who would rather vote against ——— than have Catholic rule.

"A requisition circulated by your friends would commit enough Reformers to you, before you accepted, to make your election an assured fact.

"We will be glad to have your views upon it, and will be happy to give you any further information that you may desire. Your correspondence will be strictly confidential, as we hope ours will be with you. Be assured we are going to win in the next election, which may come off this fall, for we are meeting with the utmost encouragement from every quarter. When we get a little further, along and the leading citizens return from their summer holidays, we are going to hold a large public meeting in the city, at which we would like to have your presence on the platform.

"Your obedient servant,

"H. J. BOSWELL,

"Sec. of the O. E. R. P.

"29 Adelaide Street East."

"vindicate the principles of civil and religious liberty in Ontario." No compromise with "Popery," that was the password; that was the "Open Sesame" of success to Reform politicians; men whose narrow minds succumbed to a barrel, and only saw the world through the bung-hole." The Archbishop told his people to stand by those who stood by them. In his letter he wrote as a citizen, not as a priest. He was exercising his right as an elector. He was not "prostituting his sacred character for merely party purposes, or using the church and the altar as the battle-ground for contending factions." His Grace had an elector, and as an elector he spoke and wrote, and had the right to speak and write, off the altar, as well as any voter in the land. But the fight did not end there. The Reform party was thwarted but not beaten. In 1867 they made another attempt to extinguish the

"Popish Institutions of Ontario."

In that year they raised the cry of the "Complete Separation of Church and State." This was a subtle blow at the Catholics again. They expected a grand rally to their reconstructed platform, which meant: Away with the Separate Schools, away with the House of Providence, away with the Good Shepherds, and away with every "Popish institution" that obtained money from the Provincial Treasury. No matter whether they rescued the unfortunate, fed the hungry, clothed the naked, attended the sick—the good priests and pious nuns, who trod the road of dusty death to benefit the human race—all had to go, for "Church and State," or the Reform party demanded it. As Alexander Mackenzie said: "The atmosphere of the Province does not agree with them, and they should go. Nor did their hostility end there. In 1873 there was another complication. In that year the

Orange Charter

came before the Legislature. Mr. Mowat voted for, and carried the Charter, by a majority of seventeen. Mr. Mowat, however, had grown subtle in his career. He was now stooping to conquer. The Irish Catholics were no longer hewers of wood, and drawers of water. They were making their power felt in elections, and the man who canvassed South Ontario to the music of "Vote for Mowat and no Popery," in 1857, had grown a little—not much—but a little wiser in his generation. He passed the Orange Charter, but was afraid to recommend its becoming law. He sent it to Sir John, and, with a callousness which outlived Amniasias, he begged that it be *disallowed*. The measure he voted for, the Charter, he passed through the house, he tried to strangle in the dark. He thought he would please the Orangemen by publicly recommending the passage of the Bill; he thought he would please the Catholics by privately choking it out of existence. The trick was discovered, its unconstitutionality exposed, and Oliver Mowat convicted in the eyes of public opinion of an attempt at political fraud. He tried to deceive the Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants alike. He played fast and loose with the Orange and Green. And so the Bill fell to the ground. The Orangemen were furious. They should be conciliated, and twelve months after the Hon. Mr. Mowat returned to his first love, and passed an "Act" respecting Provident and other Societies." This Act conveyed to the Orangemen *all the powers that had been granted by the House in the Charter of the year before*. It was simply Orange Incorporation under another name. It was another subtle attempt to deceive Catholics and Protestants alike. Mr. Mowat *thought* he would please the Catholics by leaving out the words "Orange Incorporation," and he *thought* he would please the Orangemen by granting them all the power they asked for. He was playing the old game of divide and conquer. He kept the Irish at each other's throats, and stole the pass-key to power, during the squabble. Here are his own words referred to above. He said:

"The general bill gave the Orange Societies a better means of incorporating than their own leaders were willing they should have. If the Grand Lodges have chosen to be incorporated there was no difficulty about the Subordinate Lodges, and in the next session the difficulty had been removed by an amendment expressly providing that any branch of an incorporated society of the character aforesaid may be incorporated. It would be a pity if the bill, which gave the general act that the grand act that of the special bill, that the former was the simplest, best, and least expensive.

And yet it was "not Orange Incorporation." The rose by that name would not smell so sweet. He had incorporated Orangism in a "simpler, safer, and less expensive" way than Orangemen themselves demanded—that was for the Orange societies; he had *not* granted Orange Incorporation and was the enemy of Orange incorporation; that was for the Catholics; and as the devil always beats the world at a barter, so did the Hon. Mr. Mowat succeed in deluding both sides of the House. There are thousands of Grit Orangemen who are the friends of the Reformers, and there are thousands of Grit Catholics who to this hour are under the impression that Mr. Mowat refused to incorporate the Orangemen. But let us see what he says about it himself. Speaking on the 7th of February, 1877, he said:

"In 1858, in the old Parliament of Canada, I voted for Orange incorporation; and here, in the first session, when I have the honour to occupy my present position, I have voted the same way, and I still thought the Orange body was entitled to incorporation if it desired it.

And yet he *did not* incorporate "the Orangemen; he only passed an "Act respecting Benevolent and other Societies." But later still in 1878, we find him speaking in the Amphitheatre, Toronto, where he said:

"I voted for Orange Incorporation once, and I will vote for it again under similar circumstances, should I have it.

Yes, but it must be called "Orange Incorporation." The "Popish institutions" must not be so far offended; dust must be thrown in their eyes. The old feud must be kept alive at all hazards. The Irish must not be allowed to know each other better, for they might then like each other more. The battle-ground of strife must be kept cleared for action. From the first day the Hon. Mr. Mowat entered public life to this hour he has been the frank opponent of the Irish people, Protestant and Catholic alike. He and his friend, the Hon. Wm. Mc-

Sheets issued by the Tories for distribution during the

General Election Campaign of 1863. It is devoted to attacking and arraigning the Mowat Government for alleged gross injustice to the Irish Catholics. (1) This sheet was prepared by a gentleman then in the employ of the Tory party. (2) He received his salary through the Tory organizer, H. H. Smith, of Peterboro'. (3) C. W. Bunting, of the "Mail," gave instructions as to the character and scope of the Document. (4.) Sir John Macdonald, W. R. Meredith, and C. W. Bunting were each handed proofs of the sheets. (5.) Each made suggestions as to the alterations necessary to make the appeal more complete, and (6.) Each gave special orders that it should be very largely circulated among the Irish Catholics.

Electors read it carefully, and then decide for yourselves whether the political leaders, who were the authors of such a document, can be regarded as the champions of Protestantism, or even worthy of the slightest degree of respect or confidence by the Electorate of Canada. In 1863, to try to serve a point, they allege the Government to be ultra Protestant. In 1886 they allege that the same Administration is ultra Catholic.

Dougall, that Lone Fisherman of political life in this country, have acted on the principle, as Mr. McDougall once said, that there should be

"No Irishman in the Cabinet."

He entered public life as a *praise* of the *Globe*. That journal damned him with praise. On December 14th, 1857, it said that he "represents *sound principles*," which meant, in the language of the Reformers of that day:

"Saucy and vicious, ignorant beast; Nothing remains but to make him a priest."

Of course the *Globe* applauded him. It is said that he could

"Satisfy the most unreasonableness, that he was sound on all the great questions of the day,

which meant the "warty insects," the "mass houses," and the "holy dolls." He was *sound* because he opposed the Irish then as he does now. He was in accord with the "principles" of the Reform party, which were again the "principles" of the Reform leaders:

"The people of South Ontario will be called upon to decide whether the ideas which are to rule this great country are to be those of the United States, or the Upper Canada Liberty party." Lower Canada priest-ridden party, or the Upper Canada Liberty party."

Those were the "principles" under which the Hon. Mr. Mowat made his bow in the House of Assembly. Has he changed?

The Hon. Mr. Fraser

says he has. But the Hon. Mr. Fraser is not an impartial witness. Let us see if the Hon. Oliver Mowat of 1883 is not the same Hon. Oliver Mowat of 1857. It is an accepted practice in this country that the Cabinets of the Dominion and the Provincial Governments shall be formed with a view to give each of the largest creeds and nationalities representatives in these bodies. It is a wise and statesmanlike custom. It is fair to all. In the Cabinet of the Dominion, the French-Canadians, the Irish Catholics, the Protestants and others are represented, and their representatives hold their position, because of the relation they bear toward certain sections of the community. In the Cabinet of Quebec it is the same. The Protestant minority and the Irish Catholics are represented in the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mousseau. But in the Cabinet of the Hon. Mr. Mowat this is not so. There the policy is, "No Irish need apply." Protestant and Catholic are treated alike. The Hon. Mr. Fraser tells us that he is a "Canadian." He repudiates the Irish. Here are his words. Speaking at Dunnville in 1879, he said:

"I suggested that all this wrangling about Scotch and English and Irish should be an entire forgetfulness of those who have since 1857 governed this country, and that the only consideration should be that of the population of this Province, was a native Canadian born, and in 1871 three-fourths were native Canadians. I said if representation was to be re-planned and directed, and governed by nationality, there should be some consideration given to those whose nationality was Canadian." (A.P. please.)

But the Hon. Mr. Fraser appears to forget that were it not for all this "wrangling" he would not now be where he is. It is this "wrangling" about what he decries—"Catholic representation"—that placed him in the position he occupies. He owes that position to the Irish Catholic people, and their reward is that he preaches a species of Know-nothingism in reply. Sir John A. Macdonald gives us representation, treats us liberally, gives our people some of the best positions in the Dominion; the Catholic Mr. Fraser decries all agitation for Catholic representation in the Dominion. It is time for the Catholic of Ontario to thoroughly understand the issue. According to Mr. Fraser's own account he does not represent the Catholics of Ontario, and it is better that they should know it. In another part of his speech he said:

"I trust that, nothing more will be heard of Catholic representation or Scotch domination.

We hope the Hon. Mr. Fraser will be disappointed. The cry of "Catholic representation" should be continued. It has been on the whole, fairly successful; we should make it more so. He may hear it so long as the Reform party denies the Catholic their fair share of representation in the councils of the people and the emoluments of office. The Hon. Mr. Fraser owes a good deal to the Catholics of Ontario, and he should be willing to echo the words of Sir John A. Macdonald:

"Gentlemen, the principle of civil and religious liberty must be vindicated; the Catholic people of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec."

Does the Hon. Mr. Fraser forget that the Protestant minority of Quebec, with a population of 189,399, is *guaranteed* twelve representatives in the House of Commons by the British North America Act; while the Catholic minority of Ontario, with a population of 328,839, has no guarantee at all. We rejoice at the representation the Protestant minority of Quebec has in the affairs of the Dominion. We are glad to know that apart from the twelve constituencies that are *guaranteed*, there are others that return Protestants as well. Here are the facts as given by the census of 1881:

Population of Quebec.....	1,792,848	Total.	
Catholics.....	1,539,927	All others.	
Population of Ontario.....	349,839	189,399	1,923,228

Thus we see that the Catholics of Ontario are *one-sixth* the total population, and have no guarantees; while the Protestants of Quebec are only about *one-seventh* the total population, and they are guaranteed twelve M.P.'s in the House of Commons! And yet Mr. Fraser tells the Catholic people that he wants to hear no more of "Catholic Representation." We do not ask for an amendment to the Constitution. We do not want any remodelling of the British North America Act. All we want is that what is *law* in Quebec should be *custom* here—fair representation for the minority. Sir John A. Macdonald says that the Catholics of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec; but Mr. Fraser says, in effect, "No, they are not." He will not have any "wrangling" about the subject at all. Better, he implies, that we should accept the situation, than raise what our enemies call the "sectarian cry." We repeat that we rejoice at the liberty the Protestants of Quebec enjoy. We would not rob them of the smallest share of it. We would, if justice demanded it, give them more rights and privileges than they even

now possess. There is no room in this Dominion for religious ascendancy. But as we are willing that that principle should be applied to others, so do we wish it to be applied to ourselves. The Catholics of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec" equal rights for all—and until they are obtained the agitation to secure them will, we hope, be continued. Nor does Mr. Fraser's analysis of the population by nationality meet the situation. He says "that in 1871 three-fourths of the population were native Canadians. Perhaps so; but they were "French Canadians," "Irish Canadians," "Scotch Canadians," and other nationalities.

Many of the men that he calls "Native Canadians," call themselves "Irish Canadians," and they ought to be the best judge. To call them "native Canadians" *does away with the demand for Irish Catholic representation!* It is the barrier in the way; that is the thing we must not "wrangle" about. But that is just the thing we hope our people will "wrangle" about until they obtain that measure of fair play to which their numbers, their wealth, and their intelligence justly entitle them to. These "Irish Canadians" are just as loyal to the country they live in as any "native" in the land, and no friend of theirs will tell them to cease "wragling" for representation in the Councils of the people. If the Catholics of Canada ever get their religious Rueneymede it will only be by doing that which Mr. Fraser says they ought not to do—"wangle" for it.

But the Hon. Mr. Fraser goes further. At a banquet given to him at the Rossin House, Toronto, he said: "I am free to say here, in the presence of my chief, that I would be willing to quit public life to-morrow, and confidently leave the interests of my co-religionists in the hands of Mr. Mowat, so certain am I that absolutely fair play would be given my people, so long as the man who sits there leads the Legislature of Ontario."

And all this is said of the man "who sat there" and voted for Orange Incorporation in 1859; who "sat there" and voted against the Separate Schools in 1863; who backed up the "principle," the "sound principle" of "No Popery" and the "Mass houses," who deceived the Catholics by "incorporating" Orangism; and who deceived the Orangemen by advising the "disallowance" of the bill! Most men have three characters: that which they show, that which they think they have, and that which they really have. The "show" character of the Hon. Mr. Mowat is a *pretence at liberty?* what character he "really" has, his record as a politician tells. Mr. Fraser may be, "willing to trust the interests of his co-religionists" to such a man, but the Catholics, and particularly the Irish Catholics of Ontario, we believe, will not. The Catholics of this Province can never have confidence in Oliver Mowat. He has always been their enemy. How different the language of

W. R. Meredith,

the leader of the Local Opposition, the son of an Irish Protestant. This man comes of a liberal stock. His father bequeathed \$500 to the Sisters of Mount Hope Orphan Asylum, London. The son of such a man must have breathed an atmosphere of liberal opinions. W. R. Meredith in 1883 echoed similar words to those used by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1866. He said in his place in the Local Legislature in January of the present year:

"I recognize the right of the Catholics in this country to fair play. Any one who would adopt any other course was not a true Canadian, and I recognize the right of the Catholic authorities to give their advice, and to make enquiry with respect to what books are used in our High Schools in which the children might be taught.

Compare this with the "Bloodhounds of Rome"—"opposition to the Separate Schools, the fight against St. Michael's College, the vote and the no vote for Orange Incorporation, the Scotch exclusiveness of the Cabinet, and, as we shall prove further on, the denial of our people a fair share of the emoluments of office. Mr. Meredith would, if returned to power, take an Irish Catholic into his Cabinet; Mr. Mowat "wants no Irishman" in his Ministry. Yes, McGee was right. There can be no doubt about it. For

"Bigotry and intolerance. Clear Gritism outbids Orangism itself."

Conservationism has taken the bigotry out of many Irish Orangemen; Reform "principles" only fixes it on the more strongly." The "Reformer" in Canada would be a "Tory" in Ireland. The Scotch Grit is, and has been, the open antagonist of everything Catholic; the Irish Orangemen often, very often, voted for Catholic measures one after the other. The Scotch Grit of to-day may not be as fanatical as his fathers were at the battle of Drumclog, immortalized in "Old Mortality," when the Covenanters charged, with the Bible in one hand and a sword in the other, to the cry of "Jesus and no quarter." They may not stand enthusiastically by the Covenant, that document that teaches that the

"Papists are now damned and confuted;" "that our Sacraments are five bastard Sacraments," and that speak of the "Roman Anti-Christ."

But there may be too much of the old fire left. The world has out-grown intolerance such as this. Bigotry has seen its worst days. We are no lovers of *Orangism*. As Catholics we cannot be. But whatever we may think of the institution, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that *Orangemen* have often voted for Catholic measures with refreshing liberality. The feuds of past decades are dying out forever. A spirit of tolerance is abroad. "Hating each other for the love of God" is becoming a thing of the past, and were it not for the "principles" of the Reform party and their bitter opposition to Catholic rights, the people in Canada would now be living under conditions which would remind us that the day was coming—

"When man to man the world o'er,

Will brothers be for all that."

But some people say that the Reform party is "friendly" to Catholic interests *now*. They tell us that the Reformers of Ontario hold the same relation to the Catholic people of this Province as that held by the Conservatives to the Catholic people of the Dominion; but let us see:

In the Department of Education, Toronto, there are fifty-eight employes, who cost the country about \$48,000 a year, and there is only

One Catholic in the Department, and he was appointed before Mr. Crooks took charge of his present office.

In the Registrar-General's office there never has been a Catholic permanently employed within its walls.

In the Treasury's Department, Toronto, there are \$15,000 a year spent in salaries, two getting \$2,000 each, one \$1,800, one \$1,400, one \$1,200 two \$1,100, and so on, all of whom are Protestants; down to the Messenger, the solitary Catholic employed in the Department, and he gets just \$300 per annum.

Mr. Mowat's Department has not a Catholic appointed by him.

Mr. Hardy has not appointed a Catholic to his Department since he came into power.

Mr. Pardee has not appointed a Catholic since he became Minister of Crown Lands.

Mr. Fraser has appointed two Catholics—only two—to become Minister of Public Works.

The Insane Asylum, London, costs in salaries, \$12,900 a year, out of which the Catholics get \$800.

The Agricultural College, Guelph, costs in salaries \$11,200 a year, of which the Catholics get \$600.

In the Department of Immigration there is not a Catholic permanently employed.

The Catholics are made "housekeepers," "messengers," and other hewers of wood and drawers of water by the "friendly Government"; that is the sum and substance of it all.

Or let us take some of the recent appointments made by the Mowat Government, and we see the same story—the same antagonism to Irish Catholics; the same old hostility in another form.

Protestants.	Per Year.
A. H. Dymond.....	\$2,000
Mr. Lumsden.....	2,000
Mr. Smith.....	2,000
Mr. McKeenrick.....	2,000
(This gentleman succeeded a Catholic, Mr. Devine)	1,500
Mr. McKewish.....	3,000
Captain Purden.....	1,200
Mr. Symes.....	1,200
Mr. Laird and wife.....	1,200
Mr. Thomas.....	800
Mr. Laird.....	800
Mr. Mann.....	500
Mr. Bascad.....	800
Mr. Savage.....	800

And what do the Catholic champions of the Mowat Government say to that? We may be told that we have forgotten Mr. McCrossen, of Penetanguishene. Not at all. Mr. McCrossen succeeds a Catholic, Mr. Kelly. It would hardly do to turn the Catholics out altogether. As for Mr. Merrick's appointment to the Shrievalty of Prescott, it is more honorary than beneficial, more showy than remunerative. Now we are not a race of office seekers. We do not wish to see our people "bend the supple hinges of the knee that thirt may follow lawning." We ask no favours because we are Catholics or Irishmen, but we protest, and will continue to protest, when we are excluded from place or power because of the religion we profess or the country we come from. We do not advocate the rights of Catholics on "sectarian" grounds but on the principle for which men have fought in all ages—equality before the law—civil and religious liberty. When taxed to support the State, the Catholic is as much entitled to the good things that are going as anyone else. Nor will the Orange cry do duty again. That issue is blinded us in 1879. It will do so no longer. There is something clearer and nearer to us now—equal rights for all. This is just what the Mowat Government denies us. It is the old road in a new form. It is crushing the "Papists" in another way. It is to the pockets of many Catholics what the "Separate Schools" were to their principles. The Catholics of Ontario should not be led away by false issues. We give the facts, from the parliamentary returns, and no one can honestly contradict them. But see bow the

Conservatives have Treated the Catholics

all over the Dominion. Let us compare the two balance sheets and give an impartial answer. In 1871 the Catholic League was formed. It bad for its object the winning of Catholic representation for the Catholic people. It brought the *Globe* to its marrow bones. The late Hon. George Brown promised everything. He promised the leaders of the league representation according to population. The Conservatives would not be bound by any promises at all. The result was that many Catholics became Reformers, only to be betrayed. It was mainly owing to the "Catholic vote" that the Reformers were returned to power in 1874. It was, in a large measure, because of the promises the Reformers made to the Catholics, that they sat on the Treasury Benches. Before that Reform triumph the Hon. John O'Donohue said that if the Reformer's were not true to their promises he would be one of the first men to throw them overboard. Well, the Reformers triumphed and with what result? During the whole of Mr. Mackenzie's term of office not one Catholic was appointed to the Bench! He won the support of some Catholics by promises of fair play. He told them that he would take an Irish Catholic into the Cabinet; but, like the Hon. Mr. Mowat, he took a Scotch Catholic, or a "Canadian" instead. He dares not face the howl of anger from his supporters, when it was hinted that the Ministry would like to see the Hon. Mr. Anglin in the Ministry. During his four years of power he shut the door in the face of the "Catholic place hunters." He almost caused a political free fight in Montreal when he appointed an Irish Catholic Chief of the Water Police at a salary of \$1,200 a year, and that, too, in place of another Catholic, who had died. The late Mr. Devlin, M.P., was told by some irate Scotch Reformers in Montreal that that appointment might cost him his seat in the House of Commons. Like beggars like, and it was "No Popery," working in secret both in Ontario and the Dominion. Scotch ascendancy was crowding us out, and the Catholics of the country saw it. In 1878 they resented this exclusiveness, and had their revenge. They taught the Reform party that the day for "using" the

This is an exact copy of one of the Campaign

Sheets issued by the Tories for distribution during the General Election Campaign of 1863. It is devoted to attacking and arraigning the Mowat Government for alleged gross injustice to the Irish Catholics. (1) This sheet was prepared by a gentleman then in the employ of the Tory party. (2) He received his salary through the Tory organizer, H. H. Smith, of Peterboro'. (3) C. W. Bunting, of the "Mail," gave instructions as to the character and scope of the Document. (4.) Sir John Macdonald, W. R. Meredith, and C. W. Bunting were each handed proofs of the sheets. (5.) Each made suggestions as to the alterations necessary to make the appeal more complete, and (6.) Each gave special orders that it should be very largely circulated among the Irish Catholics.

Electors read it carefully, and then decide for yourselves whether the political leaders, who were the authors of such a document, can be regarded as the champions of Protestantism, or even worthy of the slightest degree of respect or confidence by the Electorate of Canada. In 1863, to try to serve a point, they allege the Government to be ultra Protestant. In 1886 they allege that the same Administration is ultra Catholic.

DATE

X

