

heartily wish them well. The public-house may become an institution of only secondary utility to the public library if our legislators have but the sense to see it, and shall we say the independence too?—for there is that most awkward customer, the big, money-ed brewer, to tackle.

* * *

"Upon one point in this matter of temperance reform our magistrates should lose no time in making their voice heard. The publican who makes his public-house nothing but a drink-shop, and therefore in nearly every case a standing nuisance to the community, should receive peremptory handling. A correspondent tells us that the other day when cycling through King's Langley, in Hertfordshire, he called at a village inn for something to eat. Round the bar was a crowd of Sunday drinkers in more or less advanced stages of intoxication; bad beer was being literally ladled out, and the landlord spurned the notion of bothering to serve anything but his filthy liquor. Let magistrates make it known that a repetition of such a refusal would endanger the license, and a change would soon come over these centres of excess. As the magistrates at Solihull, in Warwickshire, have just had the sense to tell a publican, a public-house is not a mere drink-shop, but a place of reasonable refreshment."

If those who labour so faithfully in the temperance field, will abandon fruitless efforts to change a custom common since the time of Noah, and will unite in a laudable attempt to see that the wine and beer consumed in the country is pure and wholesome, and the bars and beer-gardens well-managed, then even they will admit that Principal Grant was fully warranted in declaring that intemperance is a decaying vice, and Canada a remarkably sober community.

We are glad to think that the days of intemperance are passing away, that it is no longer considered necessary to have a seasoned head to be thought a good fellow. Yet it must surely be apparent to the most ardent teetotaler that the plan of reform proposed in *The Outlook* is infinitely better than compulsion.

"It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing;" and beyond controversy, no object can be much better than the promotion of temperance. But any compulsory measures in dealing with the masses are sure to arouse hostility. When Sir Wilfred Lawson first proposed parliamentary action as a means of checking if not absolutely prohibiting the use of strong drink, the British workman rose in rebellion, and, regardless of the curious convolutions of his grammar, was represented in the doggerel of the day as saying:—

*Blow their eyes, if anyone tries,
To rob a poor man of his beer.*

This same spirit of resentment at Government interference, may retard the growth of the teetotal movement in Canada, and it would be well for the good and earnest men, whose commendable zeal is responsible for the somewhat costly question of yesterday, to consider the excellent suggestions contained in the paper we have quoted from.

GREATER MONTREAL.

When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built most intelligent observers predicted the early and rapid development of its two termini, Montreal and Vancouver. Some of the predictions made were regarded as fairy stories; yet it is doubtful if any of the anticipations of those days equalled the realisation of to-day. We do not imagine that Montreal's phenomenal development since the construction of the great trans-continental railway has been entirely due to that cause; it has been due to a number of causes, sufficiently evident, and still in operation; of which, however, the Canadian Pacific was for that time and perhaps still is the greatest. The important thing is that we should all realize that Montreal has grown and is still growing prodigiously, because it will greatly assist the development of our City, if its own people believe in its future. The work of preparing a new charter for Montreal, which has just been commenced is really of such vast importance, that it is worthy of the best thought of the best business mind in the City. It may be said that our railway magnates, bankers, merchants and insurance men by developing their own businesses are contributing more financially and architecturally to the building up of Montreal, than they would do, by dabbling in civic politics. In a sense this is true, but in reconstructing our municipal corporation at this time it is most desirable that large ideas should prevail. The civic management of Montreal has been left too much in the hands of little Montrealers, and, as the natural result, the Corporation has done little to promote the growth of the City beyond piling up a most respectable debt. What has been done by private enterprise is manifest. No-body needs to ask what has been done to build up Montreal by the Allans, the Harbour Trust, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific, McGill College, the great banking and insurance corporations, the Street Railway, the cotton, sugar and tobacco companies. The influence of these institutions is patent to every-body. The Corporation did one splendid thing for Montreal, when it bought Mount Royal for a public park, but outside of that excellent investment, most of its large debt has been incurred in making improvements, some of very questionable value: in establishing a water supply which will never be satisfactory, in widening and at the same time ruining such streets as Notre Dame Street; in putting "permanent" paving on streets which have become mere swamps, like Craig Street. The grievance Montreal tax-payers have against the Corporation, is not the burden of the debt, which is heavy; or the burden of taxation, which is light; but the fact that they have so little to show for either. While so much is being done by private enterprise to advance Montreal, the civic corporation ought to be doing yeoman service on the same lines. The construction of a new charter offers an opportunity for a radical departure. The legal experts who drafted the charter seem to have had some idea of this sort, be-