

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 men in the trade as respectable, as upright, as incapable of deliberate or wilful crime against society as Mr. Finch himself. There are some black sheep, and experience shows that the number will be increased tenfold if Mr. Finch's policy of Prohibition is adopted; but are there not also some black sheep in Mr. Finch's trade, which we presume is that of a politician? The motive for bringing against the manufacturers and sellers of liquor these charges, which no sane being even on a party platform can believe, is that, in order to get rid of the inconvenient claim to compensation, it is necessary to harden the heart and deaden the conscience of the public. A Christian Church, we repeat, is hardly the proper scene for these orgies of uncharitable invective. We will add that sins of malice are worse than sins of sense; bad as drunkenness is, it is not so bad as malignity and injustice.

The Scott Act people, it appears, are circulating as a campaign document a sermon by Canon Farrar on the evils of drink. Canon Farrar is to say the least highly rhetorical, and even as regards England his language is somewhat Apocalyptic. After all, as has been said before, these beer-drinking English are not a race of valetudinarians and imbeciles: they are both in body and mind about the most energetic of all races, their greatness is the envy of other nations, and they happen to be remarkably long-lived. But when will people understand that Canada is not England, and that language which may be applicable to one is totally inapplicable to the other. In England not only are the natural habits of the people less temperate than those of our people, but the Licensed Victuallers are an organization of enormous wealth and overweening power, pushing its branches almost by force into every corner of the country: not waiting for a demand, but thrusting its beer on the people and exerting in aid of its commercial objects a political influence of the most formidable and tyrannical kind. We have nothing like this organization of evil here, and those who transfer Canon Farrar's dismal descriptions from his own country to ours might almost as well transfer to our sanitary condition a description of that of New Orleans at the time of the yellow fever. The people of Canada, we repeat, are on the whole temperate and have been giving during the last half-century the most satisfactory proofs of their power of self-reform. Of the cases of drunkenness brought before our police courts, the majority belong, we believe, to an immigrant nationality, and are those of people not yet assimilated to Canadian habits. But Canon Farrar, denunciatory as he is, does not go anything like the length of the promoters of the Scott Act. He positively repudiates the doctrine that total abstinence is a duty; he admits that there are "millions of wise and virtuous men" who are not total abstainers; and he belongs to the Church of England Temperance Association, of which temperance, not abstinence, is the aim. The clergy of the Church of England as a rule are highly educated, and their high education preserves them from fanaticism and extravagance.

THERE was a double slip of the pen in our last number. It is in the *Nineteenth Century*, not in the *Fortnightly*, that Sir H., not Sir W., Thompson states his conviction that more mischief accrues to health from erroneous habits in eating than from alcohol, and intimates his impression that a similar comparison might be made between the respective influences of those agencies in regard to moral evil also. We are not sorry to be recalled to this weighty deliverance even by the necessity of correcting a mistake. Temperance is a thorough-going principle. It prescribes not merely a spasmodic and isolated abstinence in regard to one particular article of diet, but strict moderation in regard to all. Gluttony is just as strongly condemned by Christianity as drunkenness: excess in tea, which debilitates and unnerves, is just as wicked as excess in wine. But the result of forced asceticism almost always is an outbreak of sensuality in some other direction. Mahomet is being lauded by Prohibitionists for having forbidden his followers to drink wine, though the history of Caliphs and Sultans shows that his precept has, even by the Commanders of the Faithful, been most imperfectly observed. But if Mahomet forbade his followers to drink

wine, he indemnified their sensual passions by abundant license of another kind, to say nothing of the scope which he afforded to their lust of war. A philosophic writer whose work is before us seems to think that man might have remained for ever in the Paradisiacal state had it not been for two fatal inventions, fermented liquors and cookery, the first of which has led to drinking and the second to feasting. This view is at all events comprehensive, and there is more reason in it than in the view which ascribes all the ills of mortality, bodily and mental, to errors in liquid diet alone.

AMONG the other problems of this restless and sceptical age, the Sunday Question is ever and anon becoming the subject of debate. Here it has just been brought up by the controversy about Sunday newspapers. It is one of exceeding and multiform difficulty as well as of the highest importance. Our own sympathies are strongly with those who desire to preserve to humanity, choked with worldly cares and worn with toil, a day of spiritual life and a day of rest. Two things, however, are clear. One is that it is impossible to stand any longer on the old Puritan, or as it is called Sabbatarian, platform. The day is not the same, nor is there any shadow of evidence for the theory that by Christ's ordinance the Jewish observance of the Seventh Day was transferred to the First, while the reason given in the Commandment for the consideration of the Seventh Day is manifestly addressed to the conceptions of primitive man. The other thing is that legislation must not lose its touch of the real convictions and tendencies of the great body of the people. Its practical scope is limited to the repression of individual self-will or cupidity which sets itself against the general conviction, as when a single storekeeper persists, in defiance of the wishes of the trade to which he belongs, in keeping open his store and thus forcing his fellows under penalty of loss of custom to do the same. Spiritual life cannot be constrained; the utmost that can be done is to say that the opportunity for it shall not be withheld from anyone, and that nobody shall be prevented on a Sunday morning from worshipping God. The remainder of the day people must be allowed to give to rest, and there is no use in insisting that their rest shall be mere stagnation and dulness, which, instead of having a religious tendency, have often the very reverse, even if they do not impel to vicious excitements. Innocent and quiet enjoyment must be sanctioned, and the only question is how it can be afforded to the mass with as little sacrifice as possible on anybody's part of the day of rest. Sunday excursions, unfortunately, do involve some sacrifice of the day of rest on the part of those employed on the railroads and steamboats. Yet to escape from the street into the fields and the fresh air on a Sunday afternoon in summer is not only the greatest of enjoyments but a vital necessity to the languid inhabitants of the city; and we cannot help receiving with satisfaction the assurance that the local legislation of last session will not practically interfere much with the Sunday excursions of the citizens of Toronto. Country members of the Legislature, who are always breathing fresh air and enjoying nature are not very fair judges of this subject. Their Puritan legislation is at the cost of others. Let no boat start before two o'clock, so that nobody may be prevented from attending Church. This, if not a wholly satisfactory platform, is one on which for the present we can stand.

THE Russian war-cloud has evidently rolled away, though a few angry drops fall from its skirts, and the roll of its receding thunder is still heard. Every rational being must surely welcome this result, and feel that the British Government took the right course in preparing with spirit for war, and at the same time doing its utmost by patient negotiation to preserve peace. Spirited preparation for war was unquestionably necessary in order to keep under control the military party at St. Petersburg, the tendencies of which could not be mistaken, and to restore in the Russian Councils the ascendancy of wisdom represented by statesmen like De Giers and of the Czar's personal wishes, which were understood to be in favour of peace. Such a front has been made and so united a determination has been shown by all the members of the Empire, including the Indian feudatories, to repel aggression, that the fire-eaters of St. Petersburg will probably be less impetuous for the future, and thus the millions spent on preparation will not have been wasted. Difficult questions are too likely again to arise with regard to the Afghan frontier and the relations of both Empires with Afghanistan, not only because Russian commanders are restless and ambitious, but because the Afghans are unsettled, turbulent, predatory, apt to give provocation to their neighbours, and very intriguing at the same time. A common frontier for the two Empires would probably be safer than such a neutral zone, but this can be attained only by the most desperate of operations, the partition of Afghanistan. Yet there is no reason why this feud between England and Russia should not pass away and be succeeded by a renewal of the friendship which