

THE CAPITAL CITY IN LINE.

The Laymen's Educational Institute.

On September 27th-30th, Ottawa is to hold its Laymen's Missionary Educational Institute. This is one of the series of meetings in the great National Campaign of education.

The laymen of Ottawa are thoroughly organized, everything points to a very successful series of meetings. The sessions will be of an educational and inspirational character, and no church in Ottawa or surrounding country can afford to miss sending delegates to the Institute.

The permanent officers are: Chairman, J. F. Orde, K.C.; vice-chairman, J. A. Machado, Manager American Bank Note Co.; secretary, T. D. Patton, Secretary Y.M.C.A., treasurer, Albert Matthews, of Geo. Matthews & Co. The character, energy and standing of these men ensure the success of the Institute. All the denominations in Ottawa are enthusiastic and the deepest of interest is everywhere manifested.

On the evening of Monday, the 28th, a Laymen's banquet will be held, at which Mr. J. Campbell White, International Secretary of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, and Mr. Silas Mc-Bee, editor of "The Churchman," New York, will speak on missionary topics.

APPEALING FOR THE COUNTRY.

With nominations for the general elections for the Dominion Parliament on the 19th of October, polling on the 26th of the same month, any excitement and bitterness consequent on such an appeal to the electorate will be reduced to a reasonable minimum. For this relief, much thanks! It will be better for business, and better for everybody. Another cause for thankfulness is the fact that both candidates for the Premiership of our growing Dominion are men of high and unblemished character. As to the present Premier of Canada, it is not too much to say no question of moral reform, such, for example, as the Lord's Day Act, has never appealed to him in vain to the extent to which it lay within the domain of the practicable. Let us hope the big campaign may be conducted in a large spirit such as may be creditable to all who take part, and such as may be an inspiration to strong men to continue to do their best work for the nation.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

We all admit Canada's greatest industry is agriculture and the kindred interests of rural life; from which it follows everything possible should be done to make the dwellers and toilers on Canadian farms happy and contented. Good roads are a great help; so are good schools, and suitable churches—the latter being in the country parts, even more than in the cities, the centres of the social life of the community. In some parts of the country lines of radial railway are helping to relieve the sense of isolation; and the same is true of the rural telephone. And now the Postmaster-General announces the beginnings of easier, quicker, and more frequent rural mail delivery. There are twenty good reasons why the advantages of modern scientific discovery and modern methods of organization should not be confined to the dwellers in cities and towns.

WHY DIVIDE AND SUB-DIVIDE?

By Knoxonian.

One of the worst things about our political life is its divisions and subdivisions. We hear of the Catholic vote and the Protestant vote and the Orange vote and the Prohibition vote and the English vote and the French vote and the Indian vote and the Women's vote and the Laboring Man's vote and a dozen other votes. We used to have a Grand Trunk vote, and it sometimes looks as though we might have a Methodist vote. Just how many subdivisions we have called "votes" it would be difficult to say. Taking the Dominion as a whole, there must be nearly a hundred. In the East there is a Fisherman's vote and in the West there may soon be a Cowboys' vote. Between these extremes we have any number of subdivisions.

• • •

The religious subdivisions claim a good deal of attention at present. We hear and read much about the Catholic vote. Why should there be a Catholic vote? Personally, we don't believe that the Catholics of Ontario, or of any part of the Dominion, are a political unit. We think we could give an instance in which the members of a Protestant church in a certain constituency on a memorable occasion went to the polls almost as a unit and defeated one of the best men that ever served Canada. The Catholic vote is not by any means a unit. It may not be much more of a unit than some other bodies we could mention, but since everybody speaks of the Catholic vote as a unit we shall argue on that basis.

• • •

Why should there be a Catholic vote? If we are to have a Catholic vote, why not a Presbyterian vote and a Methodist vote and a Baptist vote and an Episcopalian vote and a Quaker vote? If one denomination is to move as a political unit and make its united power felt, why may not every other denomination do the same? If one denomination can demand representation in the Cabinet and on the Bench, then every other denomination can do the same thing. If every denomination must have a Cabinet minister, the Dominion Cabinet would number forty or fifty at least, and we find it hard enough work to pay thirteen. If every denomination must have a representative on the Bench, then we would have more judges than litigants in some courts. Their Honors would have to put in the time and earn their salaries by trying each other. Just picture in your imagination the state of society we should have if every denomination had to be represented in every Government of Canada. What has denomination to do with civil government, anyway? Granted that Christianity is the basis of civil government in Christian countries. We are not speaking of Christianity. We are discussing the theory that a church should be used for political purposes—a very different thing. What has denominationalism to do with the duties of a legislator or judge? Is the Canadian Pacific Railway Methodists or Presbyterians? What denomination does the N.P. belong to?

Where does the Franchise Act go to church? Not one bill in a hundred brought before any parliament in the Dominion has the slightest reference to denominational matters. When a church does need legislation a member belonging to some other religious body is just as likely to secure the legislation as the representative of the body seeking aid. If the church is the Presbyterian, perhaps the bill had better be given to an Episcopalian or Roman Catholic. The Presbyterian representatives will usually feel so much afraid of being suspected of partiality to their own church that they may not like to support the bill strongly. Presbyterian public men try to stand so straight that they often lean over to the other side.

• • •

The absurdity of clamoring for representation on the Bench is still more absurd. What has denominationalism to do with the administration of justice? Does Chancellor Boyd issue Baptist injunctions? Does he expound baptizo, and try to show that it means dip and nothing but dip? Does Mr. Justice Archibald apply the Calvinistic doctrines to his writs of certiorari? Does Mr. Justice McLaren order immediate execution on Arminian principles? Does the Chief Justice of Ontario decide appeals by the Thirty-nine Articles? What, in the name of common sense, have a judge's ecclesiastical views to do with his judicial duties? Assuming that he is a learned, able, upright man, what business has the public with his church relations? And yet there are people, even in Ontario, who talk about their denomination being represented on the Bench. There is grave reason to suspect that when either Catholics or Protestants talk much about being represented in the Government, or in the courts, they want something more than their own.

• • •

The body of the Canadian people never clamor for representation for every subdivision of society. The evil is brought about in this way: A politician wants a seat in Parliament, or his political friends want one for him. They select a constituency. In this constituency there is a local huckster who offers to sell the Catholic vote; another perhaps, who says he controls the Orange vote; a third, who offers the Workingman's vote; a fourth, who wishes to barter the Temperance vote, and so on. These hucksters want office, and they use a subdivision of society as a stepping stone to office. They work up the subdivisions, keep the lines as tightly drawn as possible, and compel the candidate to treat with the subdivisions as such. The people are sensible and patriotic if they were let alone. Demagogues play off one subdivision against another. The Catholics are taught that they ought to be represented by Catholics, the Orangemen by Orangemen, the Prohibitionists by Prohibitionists, the Workingmen by Workingmen, and so on. Class is arrayed against class, and denomination against denomination. Talk about parties; Canada would be a political paradise if we had but the two great political parties. A straight manly fight between Tories and Liberals on political issues is not a bad thing. It is cutting up the Canadian people into subdivisions, and buying and selling these subdivisions, that does the main part of the mischief. May the day soon come when Canadians shall discuss public questions as Canadian citizens, and the best men be put in prominent places, without asking questions about their political or religious creed.