

promptitude and vigour at the seat of the central authority. The North-West was not represented in Parliament; and the want of this safety-valve helped to make it possible for complaint to take the most objectionable of all forms, armed insurrection.

BEFORE another week is over our citizen soldiers will have returned to us. To make their reception triumphal as well as cordial, and to set forth in a fitting manner the gratitude felt by the community for their services, civic taste and invention have been tasked to the utmost, and we trust not in vain. They will rest in their homes with the happy consciousness of having done their duty to their country, and fight over again before an affectionate audience the fields of Fish Creek, Cut Knife and Batoche. The wish expressed by us some time ago that a special acknowledgment should be made to them for their services in the shape of a grant of land has been fulfilled by the Government amidst general applause. With their well-deserved ovation closes, we may hope, the history of the conflict which their arms have brought to a termination happy for the country. It can hardly be expected that the storm will be at once followed by a dead calm. Civil war, which ruins some and unsettles all, is apt to leave a trace of brigandage behind it. But with anything of this kind the local forces will deal. The increase of the Mounted Police will be a real economy, and it is difficult to see why any unpopularity should attach to that force, considering of what fine material it is composed, and how useful, if well regulated and commanded, it must be. It is obviously desirable also to develop the Local Militia, which must always be better fitted than strangers to cope with well-known enemies and to act on a familiar scene. War in the North-West waged by Volunteers drawn from the distant Provinces and unfamiliar with the scene of action may be glorious, but it is costly in the extreme. How much we have paid for every Half-breed put *hors de combat* will be seen when all the bills shall have come in.

THE *Christian Guardian* had not chanced to see the full returns in a local paper of the Scott Act voting in Middlesex, showing that of the 20,000 electors only 8,000, or two-fifths, had voted, while three-fifths had stayed at home, or it would not have taken us to task in somewhat discourteous phrase. We did not say that those who had stayed at home were "opposed" to the Act, but that they "had, at all events, not made up their minds in favour of coercion, and would not give it their support when the Act came to be applied." This is the practical condemnation of a sumptuary law, which is neither justifiable, as an invasion of private liberty, nor capable of enforcement unless it has the public conscience positively and decidedly in its favour. The *Christian Guardian* is greatly shocked at the suggestion that "when it comes to getting a neighbour fined or sent to gaol for an act which everybody knows to be no crime, and which the State expressly sanctions in the adjoining county, indifference may assume the form of passive resistance." Nothing is more certain than that such is in fact the result; the popular unwillingness to inflict a severe penalty for an artificial crime gives rise to a vast amount of perjury in connection with liquor prosecutions; and it is to the practical consequences of his measure that the legislator must look. The *Guardian* seems to claim not only an outward and legal conformity, but the submission of the heart, for anything imposed by the will of the majority for the time being. The will, in the present case, as we have shown before, is not that of the majority, but that of an active and organized minority. In an aggregate of counties, of which the total electorate is 398,000, the total number of votes cast for the Scott Act was only 123,000. But supposing the majority to have been real, it by no means follows that anything more than bare conformity is due to the Act, or even that it may not be a man's duty to limit the operation of the law so far as is legally in his power. A majority necessarily decides the question; but it does not, any more than the will of a single despot, constitute morality. There are such things as acts of moral usurpation. The Blue Laws of Connecticut were expressions of the will of a majority. The Fugitive Slave Law was an expression of the will of a majority; so are the British Game Laws: yet very good men facilitated the escape of fugitive slaves, and very good men would wink hard if they detected a hunger-stricken peasant in killing a hare. As to the conduct of the Methodist Church, our reference to which, though it came not from an unfriendly pen, seems also to have given offence, we suppose it will be admitted, or rather gladly avowed, that the Church has acted to all intents and purposes as a Scott Act organization, and that if it has not literally "anathematized" the liquor-dealers and their supporters with bell, book and candle, it has made them the objects of religious denunciations, to which, without great abuse of metaphor, the term anathema may be applied. The heads of the Church are no doubt aware of the liabilities which are incurred: they know the jealousy which is excited by ecclesiastical interference with political or social questions: they have reckoned the gain of such a policy

and counted its cost. We must at all events be allowed to say that the judgement of a man, especially of a minister, who is controlled by his Church is not free.

IN the same number the *Guardian* complains of the increasing use of tobacco, and proposes to make this also a Church question. The Church will have enough upon her hands; or rather she will be likely to provoke a revolt against her interference with any tastes and habits which are not forbidden by the Gospel or immoral. Whether tobacco is wholesome or unwholesome, certain it is that some of the most eminent of divines have used it. Archbishop Whateley, among others, smoked and so did Barrow. King James I., like the *Guardian*, fulminated against it, but his brochure did not bring him a crown of wisdom. The Russian Church is understood to forbid it on the strong scriptural ground that it is that which goeth out of the mouth that defiles a man. There can be no doubt that excess in smoking is injurious and produces a tendency to the most serious diseases; and in this case, as in that of wine, if moderation were impossible it would be rational to preach total abstinence. But may not this increased use of tobacco be a consequence of the ban laid by an austere Church on the moderate use of fermented drinks? Ordinary and convivial drinking is no doubt repressed by coercion, whether legal or ecclesiastical, while excessive drinking is only driven into dark holes and corners where it becomes worse than ever; but those whose glass of wine or beer is cut off will be apt to seek a substitute and a solace in tobacco or something else that soothes the sense. Human nature artificially repressed on one side is always apt to indemnify itself on another. The Methodist Church must take care that in denying its members tobacco it does not inoculate them with the taste for opium, which, as we have just been apprised, is spreading to an alarming extent in the United States. There is only one preacher worth hearing on the subject of diet, and that preacher is the medical man, provided always that he is not cajoled or terrorized by enthusiasts, but is allowed to deliver with perfect freedom the message of his science. He will, perhaps, teach us among other things what allowance is to be made for differences of constitution and occupation. The same dietetic code may not suit the robust and the weak. A preacher is exempt from manual labour. To one who is engaged all day long in manual labour of the hardest kind, tea may be less congenial and a glass of beer may be less injurious.

IN the *Nineteenth Century* Archdeacon Farrar has a rejoinder to the paper of Baron Bramwell, in which he reiterates, of course, his defence of abstinence, but again repudiates any denunciation of the temperate use of wine on religious or moral grounds. "Personally," he says, "I assure Lord Bramwell that not the most shadowy feeling of severity or unkind judgment ever entered my own mind, or the mind of any reasonable abstainer, with respect to our friends (or enemies either) who, with the most entire right to their own opinion, continue to indulge themselves innocently in a perfectly lawful enjoyment. I have said, again and again, that I should blush with shame to express a single word of censure against millions of non-abstainers of whom there are very many whom I know to be better and wiser men than myself." He adds that "many leading temperance reformers, his own honoured fellow-workers, are not total abstainers," and disclaims as "pharisaic and ridiculous" any language implying that he and those who agree with him on this question are righteous and their opponents wicked. It is a chimera, he avers, to suppose that one in a hundred thousand of total abstainers supposes that drinking wine is in itself wrong. This will not suit the Hon. J. B. Finch, or, indeed, any advocate of coercion. A man cannot rightfully be sent to prison for that which is so far from being a crime that it is the practice of men better and wiser than Archdeacon Farrar; and if drinking wine or beer is no crime, selling it can be no crime either: both parties to the traffic must stand on the same moral footing. In the theological part of his argument, we cannot help thinking that the Archdeacon encounters difficulties insuperable even by his learning and acumen. He appears to be inclined to take refuge in the desperate hypothesis of unfermented wine; but he offers not a particle of proof, and so far as the conduct and teaching of Christ are concerned, such a supposition is directly contradicted by the passage in his own "Life of Christ" respecting the miracle at Cana. Throughout that passage he distinctly treats the liquor into which the water was turned as fermented wine, and in drawing the moral of the miracle he says: "Christ's ministry is to be a ministry of joy and peace; the sanction is to be given not to a crushing asceticism but to a genial innocence." A female temperance orator is reported to have said the other day that the use of wine in the Eucharist was a relic of barbarism and immorality which she hoped to see discarded. This mode of treatment removes the difficulty with a vengeance. Otherwise the fact is insurmountable that the Founder of our religion not