

as far as the Arctic Ocean are fast following the buffalo to extinction. Indians on the north may be expected to look for extraordinary sources of supply by raiding southern settlements. This is a danger of the future against which it will be necessary to guard. Big Bear's band and his allies are the first on whom it may be necessary to set a watch; and no one can say when the vigilance which it is now a matter of safety to observe can safely be relaxed. The greatest causes for regret in this delay are that white prisoners, including women, are still in the hands of Big Bear, and that the Indians guilty of outrage and murder must, for the present, go unpunished. But Big Bear cannot safely count on a long career of immunity. Some means of surprising him in the fastnesses in which he finds momentary safety may before long be found, even if he should not fall into a trap by going after the provisions which General Strange has captured. Meanwhile his force has been reduced by defections of Chipewayans who have surrendered.

JOHN PRITCHARD and Pierre Blondin are names to be added to the bead-roll of honour. To these two Half-breeds, one with an English and the other with a French name, Mrs. Delaney and Mrs. Gowanlock owe their lives. Their purchase from the savages by whom their husbands had been murdered and themselves made prisoners, appears to have been prompted altogether by motives of humanity. Some fitting recognition of this service is now in order. A woman proposes that every one of her sex who is able to do so should contribute twenty-five cents with which to form a fund to reward the men by whom the liberty of the captives was purchased. Should the sisterhood act upon the suggestion, John Pritchard and Pierre Blondin will not go unrewarded.

AN attempt to persuade the Anglican Synod to commit itself to the Scott Act movement was summarily extinguished amidst cries of "No politics." This was the conclusive answer to the proposal. The Church is the organ of our spiritual life, and with an organ of spiritual life politics can have nothing to do. Their intrusion can only contaminate and degrade it. To pretend that Prohibitionism is not politics would be futile. It has actually run its candidate for the Presidency of the United States; it takes just as active a part in elections as any political organization; it applies political pressure to members of the Legislature; it forms the stalking-horse for a crowd of adventurers whose aim is political advancement. It is showing signs of a tendency to set up in Canada, as well as in the United States, a political party of its own. Rightly and wisely, then, does the Anglican Church refuse to make herself an organ of Prohibitionism, and resolve to confine herself to her proper function of preaching and propagating Temperance as a part of the religious character. Her places of worship, at all events, will not be made the scene of angry appeals to party passions; nor will her pulpits ring with fierce invectives and uncharitable denunciations. The thirst of political influence is unfortunately not confined to a single priesthood. Protestantism also has its Jesuits, though they play not the courtier but the demagogue, and instead of spinning the webs of their intrigue around the hearts and consciences of kings, become the organizers and leaders of agitations among the people. It would not be wonderful if in the sequel a considerable number of not unimportant adherents should be added to the one Church which steadfastly keeps herself clear of politics, and devotes herself solely to religion.

PEOPLE talk of giving the Scott Act a trial. They might almost as well talk of giving suicide a trial. If the Scott Act is adopted, all the mischief which it can do will be at once and irrevocably done. The licensed and regulated trade will be destroyed, and the contraband trade will be called into existence in its place, while all the property invested in the licensed trade will perish, and the persons employed in it, including numbers of perfectly guiltless artisans, will be thrown upon the street. What is more, the moral influences which are now acting with so much effect will be suspended, and the voluntary Temperance Associations will be broken up. But the Scott Act has already been tried, and tried with a vengeance. It is identical in principle with the Prohibition laws of Maine and Vermont. In both of these States every expedient of legislative coercion has been employed by the Prohibitionists who, as a compact body, have been able to hold the balance between the parties, and have been allowed to pile up penalties and inquisitorial enactments to the full measure of their tyrannical will. And what is the result? In Maine, the State Prison Report says: "Intoxication is on the increase; some new legislation must be made if it is to be lessened. In many of our counties prohibition does not seem to affect or to prevent it. The drunkard in the gaol will tell you that, when out, he can get all the intoxicating liquors he wants when he has money to buy with." The politicians may be terrified

into prohibitive legislation, but the conscience and habits of the people remain unchanged. Elsewhere, and notably in Canada, intoxication is decreasing under the operation of the moral influences; but in Maine, where coercive legislation has ousted the moral influences, it increases. The statistics of crime of every kind are at the same time just as high in Maine as in any other Northern State, and the promise that prohibition would close the gaols has been totally belied. Curiously enough, matrimony, the troubles of which have been all ascribed to drink, so far from having its happiness restored by Prohibition, seems to be peculiarly unhappy, the proportion of divorces to marriages in Maine being rather more than one to ten. But then, it is said, Portland is a great seaport, and the bad habits of the seafaring population spoil the effect of the law: as though it were not precisely populations whose habits are bad that the framers of the law had undertaken to reform. But in Vermont there is no great seaport, and the population of that State, if of any, is law-abiding, religious, and a favourable subject for the trial of a sumptuary law. What, then, is the result in Vermont? According to Mr. Edward Johnson, whose statements in the *Popular Science Monthly* nobody, so far as we have seen, has traversed, in Vermont also drinking-places swarm, drinking is on the increase, and the law, in spite of spasmodic attempts to execute it, is practically a dead letter. It is worse than a dead letter, since the habit of evading it must demoralize the people, while the liquor drunk in unlicensed drinking-shops is sure to be the vilest, and secret tippling is, of all kinds of indulgence, the most likely to lead to excess. Yes; tried the Scott Act has been, and there is no doubt about the result.

NAY, the Scott Act was tried long ago. It was tried in the time of the Stuarts. "In the short space of twenty-four years," said Mr. Harrop in a lecture at Cambridge, "no fewer than seven distinct Acts of Parliament were passed, each intensifying and strengthening the penalties of its predecessor, and all directed to one object, the forcible repression of drunkenness. People were not permitted to make use of taverns except under the stringent provisions I have stated. Fines, degrading exposure in the public stocks, flogging and imprisonment in the common gaols, were the punishments inflicted; an army of spies and informers was called into being; something very like inducements to perjury and malicious prosecution were held out; the king and the Parliament were of one determination in the matter; and the whole population to be dealt with was not equal to the present population of London." It is justly said that, under the Stuarts, the means of repression were much greater than they are now. Yet the policy, as Mr. Harrop avers, proved a total failure, the only effects being increase of drunkenness, multiplication of illegal ale-houses, the degradation of the national character by evasion of the law, and, lastly, the abandonment of tavern-keeping to worthless characters, because respectable men would not submit to the risk of degrading penalties. The last fact is proved by the Act 1 Charles I, chap. 3, which prescribes the flogging of inn-keepers because they were too poor to bear fines. Mr. Pike in his *History of Crime* agrees with Mr. Harrop in his account of the Stuart legislation against liquor and its failure. He adds the important remark, that better success attended the attempts to divert the people from drinking by the encouragement of innocent amusements. But the promoters of the Scott Act among us are generally speaking the same persons who want to deprive the people of their excursions on Sunday afternoon.

WE are indebted for the citation of Mr. Harrop to Baron Bramwell, who replies to Archdeacon Farrar in the *Fortnightly*. The Baron, himself an experienced and eminent judge, says that laws in restraint of drink have existed for nearly three centuries, have been broken more than others, and have caused more offences than any others, and that he has himself tried more cases of perjury arising from them than from any other cause. Evidence to the same effect was given with regard to prosecutions under the Scott Act by Mr. Idrington, Q.C., in a very able speech which he made at the Liberal Temperance Meeting at Stratford, and in which he also exposed the untrustworthiness of the statistics by which it is attempted to connect almost all crime with drink, offenders, as Mr. Idrington affirmed, being constantly in the habit of alleging drink as their excuse. Baron Bramwell makes another strong point against the Archdeacon with reference to the increasing amount of voluntary abstinence. The Archdeacon boasts that there are now in England three or four millions of total abstainers. This, indicating an immense growth of voluntary abstinence within the last fifty years, proves, as the Baron points out, not that coercive legislation is needed, but that it is needless, and that we have only to allow the moral influences, whose strength is thus attested, to continue their good work. The Baron, a shrewd and sagacious man of the world, meets effectively with light railery the somewhat sulphureous