

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN,
— PUBLISHED BY THE —
Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Company
(C. BLACKETT ROBINSON),
AT 5 JORDAN STREET, - TORONTO.

TERMS: \$2 per annum, in advance

ADVERTISING TERMS:—Under 3 months, 10 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line; 6 months, 1.50 per line; 1 year \$4.50. No advertisements charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1887.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

ATTENTION is invited to the following very liberal combination offers: THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN and *Weekly Globe* for \$2.00; THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN and the *Rural Canadian* for \$2.00; THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN and the *Weekly Mail* for \$2.00; THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN and the *London Advertiser* for \$2.00; and THE PRESBYTERIAN and Dr. Gregg's "History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada," for \$4.00. These combinations will prove most advantageous to our readers; and that such is being generally recognized is evidenced by the large number of new subscriptions and renewals daily received at this office. Might we respectfully request our readers to draw the attention of their friends to these offers?

ON another page of this issue we print a list of BOOK PREMIUMS which ought to prove gratifying reading to present and prospective subscribers. We shall be pleased to send any subscriber, remitting \$2.00, THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN during the year 1887, and his choice of a book from the list thus printed.

WE have to bespeak the forbearance of friends. It will be impossible for us to enter all the new names in time for this week's issue, or give proper credit to old subscribers who have already renewed. By next week we hope to overtake arrears of work caused by the very large additions to our subscription list during the past ten days. Our hearty thanks are hereby tendered to kind friends who have sent us in lists of names; and we venture to ask readers who value THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN to invite their friends to subscribe for 1887, and thus benefit others, while at the same time extending the circulation of their favourite periodical.

NO one can call in question the good work contemplated by the establishment of the Toronto Industrial School. Several citizens, distinguished for their benevolence, have already made timely and handsome contributions; many more accord the movement their hearty approval and sympathy. There is enlightenment enough, sufficient energy, humanity and wealth to make this institution not only a credit to the city, but a boon to those rescued and trained for honest industry by its means, and a social safeguard in these days when wild and anarchic theories are being canvassed. The appeal on behalf of the Industrial School, which appears in another column, is respectfully commended to the attention of our readers.

THE Government of Mowat came out of the contest last week with its majority about twice as large as it was at the close of the last Parliament, and nearly three times as large as it was when the Parliament began its course three years ago. The sectarian cry was the main factor in bringing about the result. Had Mr. Meredith strengthened his position by taking some new blood into his party, and with some good new men, gone to the country on purely political issues, the result might have been quite different. Whether the Government would have been defeated or not, it certainly would not have doubled its majority. At the close of the last contest, Mr. Mowat's majority was only ten or eleven. The natural history of most Governments is to weaken with time. The friction caused by governing generally alienates some supporters. Reasoning from parallel cases, one would almost expect that the majority of less than a dozen

given by the people in 1883 would have been still further reduced in 1886. Perhaps it would have been had not the sectarian cry not been raised. The one thing clear now is that they believed the sectarian cry should be stamped out, and they stamped it out accordingly. We do not regard the result as a party triumph, pure and simple. The large majorities rolled up for the Liberal candidates in many places, and the cutting down and cutting away of many Conservative majorities prove, we think, that thousands of Conservatives must have either voted with the Government, or abstained from voting. There are no such Liberal majorities in many constituencies as the returns indicate. The usual Conservative vote in several is much larger than the vote recorded last week. The figures seem to show that a large number of Conservatives had no sympathy with the cry. The lesson is obvious. The electors do not approve of raising sectarian cries for political purposes. It will not be necessary to repeat this lesson for some years.

WITH a good deal of interest, we scanned the election returns last week, to learn the effect of the sectarian cry on the Presbyterian vote. No doubt, it was expected by those who raised the cry that Presbyterians would be more influenced by the cry than any other class of electors. As everybody knows, Presbyterians are very sensitive on the question of Romish aggression. They may well be excused for their sensitiveness. Their forefathers suffered long and severely at the hands of Romanists and others. Had they believed for a moment the Mowat Government yielded, or were likely to yield, to unfair demands from Rome, they would have risen in their might and hurled that Government from power. They did something very different. A little study of the returns will show, we believe, that more Presbyterians voted to sustain the Mowat Government last week than ever voted to sustain any Government, or any man, in the past history of this Province. Among them, we believe, were many who never voted the Liberal ticket before, and may never do so again. It was confidently stated in Toronto that the Presbyterians of such constituencies as the three Hurons would go strongly against the Government. They never gave such majorities the other way. The plain inference is that a large majority of the Presbyterians of Ontario did not believe those who told them that Protestantism was in danger. They judged for themselves as they always do, and voted accordingly. We have no desire to see the Presbyterians of this country on one side in politics. We quite agree with a statement made by Mr. Macdonnell, at the last meeting of the Toronto Presbytery, to the effect that it is better for the country, and as well for the Church, that Presbyterians should not be of one political faith. But we hope we shall never see the day when Presbyterians will ask any Government, Tory or Liberal, to do a certain thing, express gratitude because it is done, and then try to hurl the Government from power, for doing what they were asked by the Church to do. That is not fair political warfare. Our readers can characterize it for themselves.

WHEN the Ontario branch of the Dominion Alliance passed resolutions asking Prohibitionists to vote for none but Prohibitionists in political, municipal and school elections, we expressed grave doubts as to the wisdom of their action. Such action may be questioned on moral grounds as well as on grounds of expediency. Is it right for an elector to bind himself to vote for any kind of a candidate, provided such a candidate pledges himself to vote for Prohibition? That question we shall not now discuss. Right or wrong in the abstract, we think, along with Dr. Dewar, Senator Vidal and others, that taking this pledge, or asking others to take it, was unwise. And unwise for this reason among many others—when an election comes round the pledge goes to the winds, and the Alliance is put in the humiliating position of seeing its action treated with contempt. Now, for a shining illustration. The other evening three of the most prominent ministers of the Methodist Church—three official men—were on the stump in Toronto promoting the election of two political candidates. The record of neither of the candidates was as good as one on the temperance question as the record of Mr. John Leys, one of the candidates they were opposing. Mr. Leys voted for the Dunkin Act; he signed for the submission of the Scott Act to the electors, and voted an-

worked for the by-law separating groceries from liquor stores. But Mr. Leys is a Presbyterian, and one of the other candidates was a prominent Methodist. And Dr. Potts and Dr. Sutherland go on the stump for the Methodist candidate, whose temperance record is not so good as the temperance record of Mr. Leys. We do not for a moment dispute the right of these eminent Methodists to do what they did. It is not our business. We merely use their act as an illustration of how little even eminent temperance advocates care for the resolutions of the Alliance when other issues are at stake. Principal Grant and the Rev. Mr. Macdonnell have been coarsely attacked many a time because they, having no faith in the Scott Act, do not support it. Other Presbyterians here and there throughout the country have been assailed in the same way. Methodists have done their full share of this work. Some of them have been ever ready to make capital out of the action of any Presbyterian who did not seem to rise to a high degree of enthusiasm when a Scott Act wave was passing. Now let these men attend to their own official men. And let us hear no more about Methodism leading the van on the temperance question. There was just one straight-out Prohibitionist before the electors of Toronto—the unfortunate Roney, who stood at the foot of the poll. How many Methodist Prohibitionists voted for him in preference to the Methodist who was running? It is said that he did not poll a dozen temperance votes in the whole city.

NOTICEABLE IMPROVEMENTS.

MANY now living can remember the way in which elections were conducted in the days of the early settlers. Then polling was not simultaneous. One constituency would have its choice made, and again settle down to the ordinary pursuits of everyday life, while a neighbouring riding would be in the agony of a protracted contest. An election was not decided in one day, but might be kept up for nearly a week. Scenes worthy of Hogarth's pencil might have been witnessed in many a Canadian settlement in early times, and to look on them now would be instructive. It may be remarked that in reference to our election laws we are as yet in advance of Great Britain in one particular. There, as here, elections are held on one day, but not in all constituencies on the same day. There can be no doubt that such an arrangement is perfectly fair to politicians of all shades of thought. None are taken by surprise; it shortens the time of uncertainty, and thereby enables people to attend better to their business and ordinary duties; above all it tends to minimize attempts at bribery and a resort to the other unworthy devices of the unscrupulous politician.

In the election contest of last week, it must be gratifying to all who love their country, and who desire the progress of their kind, that though the excitement in many places was most intense, great good feeling and good order generally prevailed. In the early times referred to, there were, for days together unlimited supplies of free whiskey at the polling booths. It was carried around in pails, from which, with a dipper, the free and independent elector could help himself. Is it marvellous that, heated with patriotic fervour and free whiskey, many serious and even fatal quarrels took place in the good old days that have gone, happily never to return?

Marked improvement is noticeable in many things connected with our political contests. Numerous meetings were held throughout the Province for several weeks. There were large numbers attending them. Keen discussions of public questions took place, and no serious disturbance has been reported. The time is not long past when it was no uncommon thing for parties at public meetings to prevent a hostile speaker being heard, and meetings were broken up by disorderly gangs. During the recent campaign the leaders of both parties addressed numerous meetings, but beyond good-humoured chaff, there were no unseemly displays. For this improved state of affairs people generally ought to be thankful. It is by fair and straightforward discussion that truth is reached. Fair play is due to opponent and friend alike. The growth of a more generous spirit is certainly an indication that ought to be hailed by every patriotic citizen.

In the city of Toronto, with its large population, only one arrest for drunkenness on election day was re-