

tion that committees be appointed to deal with the whole subject is satisfactory: to avert ill-feeling between the two peoples, some settlement must be made; but to avert ill-feeling among our own people, the settlement this time, whether its terms be arranged by England or by Canada, must be in the direction of benefitting the trade of the Maritime Provinces. As the President rightly says, the fishery interests are intimately related to other general questions dependent upon contiguity and intercourse. The older Provinces of Canada are building up themselves by Protection; but this by a natural law is done at the expense in part of the Maritime Provinces, to whom Protection, by killing foreign trade, is hurtful. Cut off as they are from the rest of Canada, their natural development would be in the direction of trade with the United States seaboard, which a Reciprocity Treaty would give them. But, while the President appears to have recognized this—while, too, conceding that any reduction of taxation should be made in the direction of an abolition of duties on the necessities of life—he appears to consider that reciprocity treaties with foreign countries are dangerous, as being likely to hamper the action of his own Government, in an emergency. And taking account of the whole tenor of this part of his Message, we are inclined to think that unless Reciprocity be indissolubly wedded with the Fishery Treaty, it will receive scant courtesy at the hands of the U. S. Government. Possibly even if united both may be rejected; but certainly separate the one will be taken and the other left.

THE President is tainted with the heresy of special protection to Labour, which, he says, should be considered in dealing with the tariff; and, touching the Chinese question, he attempts to strengthen a weak case by a reference to the legislation of Canada on the same subject. But, in fact, the legislation of both countries in that respect is faulty. To speak of Canada alone, we know that throughout the country there are many possible sources of wealth that cannot be developed by white labour. Along the northern shore of Lake Superior, in the Rocky Mountains, and in British Columbia, there are vast stores of minerals of so low a quality that their production and conversion into a merchantable shape by white labour will not pay. In the same way in Nova Scotia, large fields of coal lie unutilized because the seams dip at such an angle that they soon go beyond the depth at which the coal can be profitably extracted by white labour. Then why not employ Chinese? It is surely better in both cases to get the mineral out of the earth, even if a large part of the money spent in labour is carried out of the country—if only the smallest balance remains. Some of the money must go into circulation; the mineral is more useful active in manufactures than lying idle in the bowels of the earth; and if but a trifle of surplus remains, it is so much added to the wealth of the country. If coal mining in Nova Scotia cannot be developed by white labour without taxing every ton necessarily imported from the States by Ontario, then it would be better, and fairer to Ontario, to use the cheaper Chinese labour, and do away with the duty.

THERE is something inexpressibly touching in a Scott Act meeting. Anxious mothers, wives, sisters, are usually there, their minds filled with the peril of some near relative that has wandered from their side; and they are dimly groping after any means that seem to offer help. But all that is offered by the speaker—by the whole system of quack morality he represents—is an Act of Parliament which shall make it illegal for houses of entertainment to sell liquor. Prevent the sale it cannot, for while there is the smallest demand for an article—in this case an article that gratifies a natural appetite—the demand will be supplied. The Scott Act offers no preventive to the excessive indulgence of this appetite, it imposes no moral restraint on the unfortunate victim, and it affords no consolation to those that fly to it for some aid or comfort. Not moral but legislative prohibition is the stone it offers for bread; as though the man that can resist the entreaties and tears of wife, mother, or sister, and the influence of the distress he brings on them or his children, can be brought right by an Act of Parliament that nobody has the least moral regard for. But the situation has its humour as well as its pathos. Besides those who deserve our warmest sympathy—and among them we include a very large class who, as we believe, mistakenly look on the Scott Act as an excellent means to a laudable end—there is another class—the grimmest and most determined of Prohibitionists, and the very people who make Prohibition impossible. For a lifetime they have been attacking the digestive apparatus of those about them with puddings, pies, and bread as hard as their own features. The victims of their bad cookery suffer from chronic dyspepsia; and in a perpetual state of thirst they are warned off the only article of drink that might do them good, and deluged with leather-producing tea or coffee like diluted brick-dust. Is it wonder they prefer any fate to such diet and drink? They turn away in disgust from the alternative water-

trough, and their torturers turn to the Scott Act lecturer; while he, instead of showing them where the fault really lies, trades on, by parading, the frailties of their own relatives, hurls stale indignation at all who would assist them in a rational manner, sheds tears that have flown on a hundred platforms, and breaks down with emotion several weeks old.

It is almost a truism that words, however full of meaning to the utterer, can convey to each one only what he is capable of receiving. No one can learn from another more than the words used expresses to him, or can be made to express. The name God, for instance, conveys to a man that has explored the depths of human nature—explored all science—whose mental vision can carry him into a protoplasm or to the farthest planet,—that sacred name conveys to such a man a far deeper meaning than it does to one who cannot read, to whom the stars of heaven are but mere points of light in the night overhead. So it seems to be with the word Prohibition, only in this case the effect is reversed. To us it appears to be an unfit and utterly inefficient means of furthering the cause of temperance; but a reverend lecturer, speaking on it the other night, declared that all who are combating it are fighting against God. If this means, as it seems to do, that the two are in some sort analogous, what a degradation of the idea of God does the utterance argue. Is not the religion of the ignorant savage, whose heart melts as he falls down before his ugly fetish, a quite respectable religion beside this idolatry for an Act of Parliament? The "Canada Temperance Act of 1878" seems to have taken the place of the New Testament with these people. These two do not and cannot stand side by side; for being utterly opposed in principle the one must yield, as it appears it has yielded, to the other. In every line of the New Testament is taught the lesson that every faculty and virtue of the individual should be fostered and developed. If our life on this planet means anything it is that we have light given us here that we may grow out of the material state of existence in which we are dependent on material things, obstructed by material obstacles, into a self-reliant spiritual manhood. And any law or habit that dwarfs that development or curtails its operation, as Prohibition does, must always be enervating and vicious. Prohibition, and the whole system of morality that underlies it, is a distinct slip backward in the march of man heavenward. It is, in brief, to substitute the restraints of the old Jewish Law for the freedom conferred on man by Christianity—to substitute a lower form of religion for a higher, ceremonial and outward cleanliness for inward purity, formalism for virtue.

M. BELLAMY has ascertained that a spiral of copper heated to dull red and plunged into a mixture of acetylene and air becomes incandescent, assuming a brightness comparable with that of platinum in hydrogen. The incandescence lasts several seconds, and ends generally with a detonation of the gaseous mixture. A spiral of iron behaves itself very similarly.

MR. OTTO FAHNEHJELM, of Sweden, says the *Science Monthly*, has invented a suitable combination of a suitable substance and flame for producing light from an incandescent solid. The flame of water-gas has intense heating power. An ordinary fan-tail burner is used, the flame from which passes between two rows of vertical teeth composed of magnesia, baked and ground and moulded, with starch, under high pressure. The teeth when heated become beautifully luminous, and the light shows colours correctly, and can be used for photography.

An instrument for ascertaining the distances of accessible and of inaccessible objects has been invented by Dr. Luigi Cerebotani, of Verona. The apparatus consists of a pair of telescopes mounted on a stand, and fixed on a tripod for use. The telescopes are both brought to bear on the object, and a reading of their angular position is then taken from a graduated scale on the instrument, which compared with a set of printed tables gives the distance; the necessity for laying down a base-line as usual being thus dispensed with. Distances can also be measured between distant objects, and a rough plan of the country observed can be sketched. In the same way the distances of ships at sea can be determined.

LORD BROUGHAM, in his criticism of the "Hours of Idleness," told Byron that a pibroch no more meant a bagpipe than a duet meant a fiddle. The French delight in committing the same error as that perpetrated by the noble poet. Victor Hugo, in his grand description of Waterloo in "Les Misérables," draws a graphic picture of the cuirassiers charging the square on the pibroch was slain. M. Franosis Coppée has so confounded song and instrument in his "Jacobites," but only in the stage directions. In Act I, scene vii., Charles Edward is supposed to enter *précédé de pibrochs et de tambours*; which is much the same as if we made a Frenchman come on the stage preceded by dead marches and drums.