

though the rules of natural justice may not be formally set out in the British North America Act, or in the Canadian Statute Book, they are not the less written on Canadian consciences, and that, if he thinks that in crossing the line he has left behind all restraints on his philanthropic propensities, he never was more mistaken in his life. Of his invectives against those engaged in the liquor trade we can only say that, if a Christian church was the suitable theatre for their delivery, Christian churches in general, and those belonging to the communion of John Wesley in particular, must have undergone a great change of destination. Suppose the policy of the State requires that the calling of these men should be suppressed, and they should be deprived of their livelihood, is that a reason for overwhelming them with foul abuse, imputing to them crimes which are mere figments of a malignant fancy, and hunting them down like beasts? Is it not rather a reason for treating them, at all events, with scrupulous equity, if not for showing them some consideration and sympathy? Mr. Finch admits that not very long ago, and at the time when many of these men entered the trade, it was deemed by all persons, including clergymen, perfectly moral; and in order to make out that the liquor-sellers are nevertheless fit subjects of penal treatment, he affects to believe that they have broken faith with the community which, when it licensed them, was led to suppose that their trade would promote happiness and virtue. Does he mean to say that the community did not know that intoxicating liquors would intoxicate? All respectable liquor-sellers have obeyed the laws passed for the regulation of their traffic. What more could they do? It is difficult to believe that any person in that congregation not beside himself with party feeling can have thought that Messrs. George and William Gooderham, Mr. O'Keefe and Mr. Quetton St. George were with truth and reason described as men who "deliberately and maliciously buried their arms to the elbows in the blood of the best interests of a free people," and as miscreants "whose crimes have not been committed in moments of passion, but after coolly and deliberately figuring the profits to come from such ruin, and paying for the privilege of carrying forward such work"? Whom did they pay? The State, which by receiving the license fee expressly sanctioned their business and pronounced it moral. What does the Methodist Church itself say about the benefactions which it is receiving from Mr. Gooderham? Are these the products of social crime and tainted with human blood? There are