

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All communications intended for the Editor must be addressed: EDITOR OF THE WEEK
5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
Contributors who desire their MS. returned, if not accepted, must enclose stamp for that purpose.

CHRISTIANITY AND TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—If gentlemen who are at sea about the meaning of *oinos* will be so good as to refer to the Greek Lexicon of Liddell and Scott, they will find that the word means "Wine; also fermented juice of other kinds, such as palm-wine, barley-wine or beer, and lotus-wine." They will then, perhaps, refrain from filling up your columns with essays on this subject, which are mere exposures of their own ignorance. Y. Z.

THE LIQUOR LICENSE QUESTION.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—The controversy going on in our City Council about the reduction of licenses recalls attention to a proposition made, but for want of time not discussed fully, at the recent meeting of the Liberal Temperance Union; and as I consider it a very important subject, I think much good would be done by giving the public an opportunity of discussing it.

The proposition is to change the system of granting licenses, and to give license holders a share in administering the law. Mr. Goldwin Smith, at the head of the deputation from the Liberal Temperance Union, in addressing the Attorney-General, adverted to the second branch of the proposition as worthy of consideration, but as no official action has been taken by the Union with regard to it, the opinions expressed in this letter must be regarded as my own.

If it is conceded that Prohibition is impracticable, and that it would be more injurious than beneficial to try to enforce it, it must, I think, follow that neither the Municipal Council nor the License Commissioners, nor both combined, should have the power which now exists of reducing the number of the licenses below a point which may be called that of reasonable demand. There is no minimum in the Crooks Act, and therefore the number might be reduced to one or to nothing at all.

The uncertainty of getting licenses continued makes the trade a precarious one; and, as Mr. Goldwin Smith pointed out to the Attorney-General, a precarious trade exposes those engaged in it to many dangerous temptations.

It is most important in the interest of temperance to have the trade in the best hands, if it is to exist at all; and if we fix upon what would be a proper number of licenses for the present time, it would surely be safe enough, in a growing place, to give those licenses for a fixed number of years, dependent on good behaviour and on the payment of the fees annually. If it were also stipulated that the number should remain stationary during this period, the result would be a practical reduction as the population is increasing. In this way existing rights could be respected, as far as they are worthy of consideration, and those whose licenses were continued would have a valuable monopoly, which would make it to their interest to carry out, and assist in carrying out, the law, not only by increasing their present gains but by giving them fair prospects of renewals. Under these conditions no class in the community would be more interested than the license holders in seeing that the law is carried out. And for this reason it would also be important to secure the active co-operation of the trade in carrying out the law. It is, therefore, suggested that they should take part in its administration. What class is so directly interested in suppressing unlicensed groggeries? At present the Licensed Victuallers cannot afford to ignore the vote and voice of the unlicensed, because they consider their own position precarious, and want all the friends they can get. If they were free it would be so much to their interest to have a monopoly, and to make reasonably sure of continuing their business, that self-interest would exert itself, as it always does; and as the suppression of unlicensed groggeries would be an immense advantage to the temperance cause, it would, in my opinion, be a sufficient reason of itself for admitting the trade to a share in the administration of the law. Who so well as the license holder knows the haunts of the illicit trade, and could render so much service in detecting and uprooting it? Who so interested in having the trade kept in respectable hands, or could give greater assistance in suppressing adulterations? Without dwelling further on the reasons in support of my proposals, I will merely suggest how the trade might be represented. I see no reason why the license holders should not have the right to nominate one of the Commissioners, subject, it may and perhaps should be, to the approval of the Governor-in-Council, one not engaged in the trade himself. But, perhaps, a better mode can be suggested. A. J. CATTANACH.

U. E. LOYALISM.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—In a late number of THE WEEK a communication appeared on the above subject, properly attributing the first settlement of Upper Canada to the persecution of the Loyalists by the Republicans. The writer charges that the ire of the latter was largely due to the action of "Indians whom the fatal folly of the Government employed." The supposition that Britain was the first or only one which sought Indian allies is so general that I beg leave to correct it. In his "Life of Washington,"

Jared Sparks writes: "But although the British profited most by the employment of Indians, they are not alone to blame for using them." Stone says: "So far as principle and interest are concerned, the Americans are equitably entitled to a due share of censure."

When a contest became evident, the New Englanders appreciated the advantage of Indian allies, and sent agents among them. The adhesion of the Stockbridge Indians was soon secured. Before the affairs of Lexington and Concord, the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, April 14, 1775, addressed the missionary working among the Six Nations in these words: "You will use your influence with them to join us; but if you cannot prevail with them to take an active part in this glorious cause, at least you will engage them to stand neuter."

On May 25, 1776, Congress resolved "that it was highly expedient to engage the Indians in the service of the United Colonies, and that the Commander-in-Chief employ 2,000, offering a reward of \$100 for the capture of every officer, and of \$30 for every private, of the King's troops: also, to employ the Indians of Penobscot, St. John's, and Nova Scotia: to have the same pay as Congressional soldiers."

Much has been written of Indian atrocities; but they were provoked. The massacre of the Moravian Indians on the Muskingum, March 7, 1782, exceeds that of Glencoe in treachery, ferocity, and numbers. Sixty-two grown people (one-third women and thirty-four young people) were butchered—Indians who had forsworn war and had no arms. The *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 17, 1782, bragged of the exploit performed March 7, without the loss of a man; and of the bringing off of eighty horses loaded with booty, mostly furs.

And the soreness of the original settlers in these Provinces has been kept alive by continuous outrages since. So that only cravens, or those so mean or mercenary as to submit to any wrong or insult if they might make gain, would tolerate Annexation. Our neighbours have kept watch over us only to inflict wrong, insult, and injury; ever returning evil for good. In the fall of 1837, Sir F. B. Head ordered the rendition of a fugitive on the charge of horse-stealing: he had ridden as far to freedom as the beast could carry him. Presently after, a Dr. Holmes in Lower Canada murdered a man whose wife he had seduced, carrying the body a long way in his cutter to sink it in the river. He escaped to Vermont. Lord Gosford applied to Governor Van Ness; this man referred the Governor of Lower Canada to President Van Buren; and this Van back to the Green Mountain Van; and so there went on a shuffling of responsibility from Montpelier to Washington, and *vice versa*. And so one who had committed two of the greatest crimes against humanity got clear, in return for the rendition of an escaped slave.

Before the close of the Confederate War, the Federal rolls showed the enlistment of 35,000 Canadians. The response was that all railways converging on the Niagara frontier hurried on the Fenians. And when the Crimean War was imminent the British Minister was dismissed from Washington, though the incipient movements had been stopped. All right that U. S. agents should work here for recruits; but not that facilities should be possible for sympathizers with Britain.

Again, the armed revenue steamers on the lakes had, without demur, been allowed to descend the Welland and the St. Lawrence Canals; added to these was the iron steamer *Passport*, purchased from Canadian forwarders. And no scrutiny was made as to the freight carried over the Great Western between Detroit and Buffalo. The reverse was the case when resistance was made at Fort Garry to our Federal authority and the lock at Sault Ste. Marie might be useful in military transport: orders were hurried from State authorities at Lansing, and Federal ones at Washington, that no such use should be allowed. Quite lately orders were issued to stop the transit of produce from Duluth through Canadian Pacific Railroad facilities. If ever Annexation becomes a more general question, instances will be produced to stagger its advocates.

As to Reciprocity, I know all about its origin, and rendered service in bringing it about, while it was resisted by Hincks in Parliament, by Brown of the Liberal press in the *Globe*, by Sampson Smiley in the *Macnab Tory Hamilton Spectator*.

In January, 1842, Mr. Merritt sailed for England, and by his representations there induced the passage of the "Canada Corn Act," by which "wheat from the States was admitted free to Canada, and Canadian flour was reduced to 2s. duty only in England. So that the balance saved to this country was about \$4,000,000 per annum, and continued with increasing prosperity to Canada for nearly five years, until England opened her markets direct to the United States."

In May, 1846, in view of British Free Trade, Mr. Merritt moved in the Provincial Legislature several resolutions, of which No. 7 was: "That Her Majesty may be pleased to open a negotiation with the Government of the United States for the purpose of obtaining access for the products of Canada into the markets of that country on the same terms that American products are to be admitted into the markets of Britain and Canada." Such negotiations were opened; but they were fruitless, as the Imperial Government declined to make free imports from the States conditional upon free imports from Canada. Mr. Merritt then devised a plan of Reciprocity, and applied a great part of his time to its accomplishment, which occurred in May, 1854.

It was the best measure that could be, under the circumstances, imposed upon us by the Corn Law Bill of 1846; but I was pleased at the notice of termination being given by the States, and that every effort since to resuscitate it has failed.

The "Fair Trade" cry growing in England is a return to the principles underlying the Act of 1842 referred to, and essential to the existence of the "United Empire" principles of the old Loyalists. T. H.