

purely military, no interference with Canadian politics is involved. But interference with Canadian politics is involved when the same mark of approbation is bestowed on a member of a party government. Opinion among us is, to say the least, divided, as to the judgment which ought to be passed on the conduct of our Government in relation to the rebellion in the North-West. That some degree of responsibility attached to it for inattention to the grievances out of which the rebellion arose is the conviction probably of most Canadians, while many believe that it was altogether to blame. Whether the Minister of Militia individually administered his office with signal ability is still an open question, and an open question it will remain till the bills have all come in. There are reports, credited by many, of great waste and jobbery in the commissariat and transport departments. The mere despatch of half-a-dozen regiments to the scene of action can hardly be deemed in itself an extraordinary display of administrative ability on the part of any minister of war. Whatever the truth may be, the decision ought to rest with the community which Mr. Caron served. The bestowal of a Grand Cross on the Tory Prime Minister of Canada was intended no doubt as a general compliment to Canadians, but in its practical effect it was an interference in a party conflict on the side of the party in power. In Great Britain the head of the Government is responsible for recommendations to peerages or knighthoods, and his action may be challenged in Parliament; in our case all is done irresponsibly and behind the scenes. To win the approbation of his own community a man must display some high qualities and render some public service; but titles are not seldom the fruit of assiduous solicitation and of arts which are of little value to the community. Canada has acquired the right of making her own laws and of regulating her own tariff; to complete her measure of freedom she will have to acquire the right of being to her own statesmen the fountain of honour.

It is not necessary, we hope, for well-wishers to the Canadian Pacific to show their good-will by vilifying the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk has been all these years the great highway of this country, the source of incalculable benefits to our commerce, and an indispensable instrument of our general development. It was built, at a period of chimerical hopes, on far too expensive a scale; it was plundered not a little, and fortunes were made out of the spoils: it underwent consequently a season of deep depression, and was for some time in a deplorable condition. Yet it has done for us far more than has been done by any other road or any other work of the Dominion. For Old Canada it has done far more than any other road is likely to do. The Canadian Pacific, if the hopes entertained about it are fulfilled, may do great things for the North-West and for the Empire: for Old Canada, though her money has constructed it, it can do but little. It will simply carry past her the harvests of the North-West; its only effect upon her will be the depreciation, perhaps the fatal depreciation, of her produce. The daily assailants of the Grand Trunk, to excite prejudice against it, tell us that it is not a Canadian road, most of the stock being owned in England. Much of the Canadian Pacific stock is owned in England, and the Syndicate included firms in London, Paris, New York and Amsterdam. At a time when Canada had not the means of building a great railway for herself, the Grand Trunk was built by British investors, who lost all their money, for our benefit; that is about the upshot of the transaction; and, though people who lose their money in a speculation may not be entitled to gratitude, it is hard that they should be regarded with special bitterness and treated with injustice. The Grand Trunk has had to fight for its life against an adversary who has attacked it with an immense force of Dominion subsidies and influence. We are neutrals in the railway war and have no desire to pass judgment on the acts of either party. But when we see attempts made to excite prejudice against the Grand Trunk we cannot help saying that old services ought not to be forgotten.

GENERAL MIDDLETON'S last service is his good-humoured and pleasant repression of the unfortunate wrangle which had arisen about the conduct of different officers and their shares of glory at Batoche. Nothing is more notorious than that nobody who has been engaged in a battle is ever able to give a clear account of it. It is equally certain also that even brave men, often lose their heads in the excitement. Men lost their heads at Waterloo, but, all having gone well, the Duke put a veto on inquiry. All went well at Batoche. And now there is, we think, a general conviction that about enough has been said upon this subject. The Half-breeds actually in arms, according to the highest estimates, were not more than seven hundred and they probably fell far short of that number; in their ranks there stood boys and aged men; they were armed largely with smooth-bores and were short of ammunition for their better weapons; artillery they had none; Lord

Melgund describes them as incapable of any military enterprise or operation beyond the mere defence of their hamlet. We bore down upon them with the force of a nation of five millions under skilled commanders and provided with all the engines of modern war. The revolt was dangerous principally because it might have led to a general rising of the Indians. That peril was happily averted. To all who bore a part in quelling the disturbance our gratitude was due and was paid in unstinted measure. But self-respect forbids us to crow very loudly or very long.

WE find some of our friends saying that they see the force of our objections to the Scott Act, but that they still think they may be obliged to vote for it because saloon drinking and treating are evils for which no other remedy has been yet proposed. Saloon drinking and treating are evils, as we heartily admit, though a leading organ of Prohibition in this city was congratulating itself the other day on their decrease. But legislation of the Scott Act kind is no remedy at all. Not only is it no remedy; it has been proved by experience, repeated and decisive, to be an aggravation of the disease. In Maine, in Vermont, in Iowa, and everywhere else, the only result has been the substitution of an illicit for a licensed trade, of uncontrolled for controlled drinking-houses, and of the den for the saloon. "I have recently visited Iowa," says a private correspondent of *Harper's Weekly*, "and observed the working there of Prohibition: it means in the cities free liquor, it means not only free liquor but unregulated taverns." Surely rather than adopt legislation which only makes bad worse, common sense bids us abstain from legislation altogether and trust to the moral forces which, seconded by the warnings of medical science, have already wrought an immense improvement, and in which, after all, must be our chief trust. But it is not the fact that no legislative remedy other than the Scott Act is proposed. Liberal Temperance men propose to legislate for the discouragement of whiskey, the sale of which by the glass is the principal source of evil, leaving free the use of more wholesome drinks. They also propose strict inspection as a safeguard against adulteration. This is a perfectly definite policy, though it has not yet been formulated in an Act of Parliament, nor could, indeed, well be comprised in a single Act. It is the very opposite of the policy embodied in the Scott Act, which by making the whole trade contraband would infallibly promote the drinking of whiskey as the liquor most easily smuggled because it contains the largest amount of alcohol in proportion to its bulk. Liberal Temperance also, it must be remembered, retains the License Laws, with the regulation of taverns, which Prohibition in Iowa, and everywhere else, practically repeals. The Liberal Temperance platform is as clearly before us as if it had been embodied in a Bill: indeed its principle was embodied in the Senate amendments to the Scott Act. It will not be, therefore, for want of an alternative if any of our friends vote against their own better judgment for legislation which experience has condemned.

DEVOTEES of the Scott Act are very angry if anybody says a light word about their holy cause. They have got into the habit of absolutely identifying their own plan for promoting Temperance with Temperance itself, and they do not see that when Bishop Berkeley proposed to cure the diseases of all the world with tar water, people might smile at the panacea without being either indifferent to health or disrespectful to the best of Bishops. But they also overlook the fact that the Children of Evil are constantly receiving such provocation in the shape of menace and invective that they really show less than their Satanic nature if their only retorts are jests. No sooner does any one avow himself an opponent of Prohibition than his moral principles are impeached and he is treated as if he had sold himself to the Power of Evil. In the *New York Witness*, which is connected, we believe, with the highly-respected journal of the same name at Montreal, we find the following communication:—

A CALL TO ARMS.

My heart is in Ohio. My chief is the Rev. Dr. Leonard. My principle, Prohibition. The battle is put in array; now for the issue. On the one side are God and the kind-hearted; on the other the corrupt politicians and the rum-sellers. Who doubts the result? Those without faith. I call upon God's children, the readers of the *Witness*, to pour into the State of Ohio letters, leaflets and literature, to help the patriots and Christians of that State in their struggle with the powers of darkness. I'll do my share. Ballots are full of force and reason; let them fall in by the half million for home and country. Nehemiah defied and defeated the Sanballats of his time with the sword in one hand and the trowel in the other. With equal determination, and after his example, let us smite the modern Sanballats who would destroy our country and dishonour God with the sword of Prohibition and trowel of moral suasion. The base politician and his ally, the rum-seller, use up between them two-thirds of every dollar of our taxes. Have we lost our reason and liberty?

MAC P. BELL.

We do not mean to say that Dr. Potts, or the Rev. H. Johnson, or Mr. W. H. Howland, or the editor either of the *New York* or the *Montreal Witness*