

kind habitually, or been interested in their sale.

It has been laid down as a principle that "Freedom consists in doing anything we please that does not injure another." "That the exercise of our natural rights has no other limit than their interference with the rights of others."

I am not aware that these premises have ever been disputed, and if admitted it must follow that every individual has a right to sell his labor, or the produce of his labor, or the produce of another man's labor that he may have received in exchange for his own; always provided that in so doing he is not interfering with the rights of others. On the same principle he has a right to employ his own labor in growing grain, or fruit, and in converting those grains and fruits into any other forms he may desire as foods, deserts, or beverages; that he has the right to make beer, wine, or liquors, and to use them himself or sell to others for their use. If these propositions are correct then the whole fabric of prohibition falls to the ground, and the injustice of such legislation at once becomes apparent.

I presume it will be admitted that Governments were established for the purpose of securing to individuals the undisturbed possession of their natural rights, and, however great the power they possess or may have assumed, it is not without limit. They must be guided by certain principles; they must not trample on the rights they were formed to protect. It will not suffice therefore to say, in discussing prohibition, such is the law, and the law must be right; it will be necessary to show that its enactments are not opposed to those simple principles which are the foundation of all rights.

If these premises are correct, and the deductions drawn from them a logical consequence, it will be of no use for prohibitionists in defence to point out the magnitude of the evils that the abuse of liquor produces, the poverty and destitution that may follow such abuse, or the crimes that may affirm it has cause to be committed. All these will be resolved into the answer to one question: "Is prohibition just?" If the answer be in the negative, they may rest assured that whatever be the magnitude of the evils that are said to follow, and to be caused by the consumption of spirits; they have not found the right way of treating them; and if they employ or rely upon any method that attacks our freedom and interferes with our natural rights, they are acting unjustly towards every individual, and will never accomplish the objects they have in view.

Although I do not anticipate that these views can be shown to be unsound, I should indeed be sanguine if I expected everyone to be at once convinced that prohibition is wrong; it will therefore be necessary to strengthen my own view of the case by weakening that of my opponents. I expect, therefore, to be able to show:

1st. That the evils referred to are not by any means such as are usually represented.

2nd. That the statements made by temperance advocates are exaggerated and overstrained.

3rd. That the statistics made use of to show the evils of intemperance under license law, and the abatement of those evils under prohibition, are incorrect and unreliable.

4th. That the effect of liquor as a chemical agent acting on the human system, is not such as to cause men to commit crimes.

5th. That the assertion that from three-fourths to nine-tenths of all crimes committed are caused by liquor, is not founded on fact.

6th. That the sum total of human misery would be very little less than now if liquor did not exist.

7th. That the evils created by the enforcement of prohibition will be as great as those it will remove.

8. And that, therefore, if the principle was just, it is not worth what it costs; which is the same as saying that if just, its enforcement would not be advisable.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ONTARIO.

No. 3.—The War of Independence and the U. E. Loyalists.

BY G. MERCER ADAM.

Events were now about to bring into greater prominence not only the historic "Pass by Toronto," but the region through which the Indian trail led northwards to the waters of Lake Huron, the virgin site of Toronto itself, and the beautiful harbor that lay near to the southern outlet of "the Pass"—the red-covered delta of the Humber. From the fall of Quebec and the period of the dismantling of Fort Rouille, a generation in the haunts of men was to pass away ere we again hear of Toronto, or see sign of renewed life and activity in its neighborhood. Nature was fast resuming its sway over the place, and the little clearing round the trading-post was again being given up to solitude. Meanwhile, the drama of life was proceeding elsewhere, and through the scattered colonies of the continent there ran the pulsations of a quickened existence. Our last article ended with the close of French rule in Canada: this opens with a new era of colonial history in America. European settlements in the New World had hitherto mainly been for trade; now they partook of the character of, and felt the desire to be, a nation. The days of great privileged companies, with their huge land-grants and restrictive monopolies, had passed, and the ties, commercial and political, between the Mother Country and the colonies, were already being sundered. Britain's dream of empire over the New World had been fully realized, and the trading classes of the "tight little sea-girt isle" threw up their caps when she became mistress of the Western Continent. But while she had bravely conquered she could not wisely hold. Her wars in the Old World had financially crippled her, and she looked to the New to have her coffers refilled. Nor was the desire altogether unnatural. The public debt of England had been piled up largely on account of her colonies; and it seemed reasonable that with their growth and prosperity return should in some measure be made to the Mother Country for what they had cost her. But how and in what shape was this to be returned to her? To lay heavier duties on her own imports would be to tax herself, not the colonies. To lay them on the colonies English statesmen never dreamed would lead to revolt. To tax the carrying-trade was first attempted, and when this was kicked at, what was carried was then taxed. But as little was this relished as was the proposed but cancelled Stamp Act. What took place at the port of Boston, and what came of it, are too well known now to take up space to enquire into. With their birthright British colonists had inherited British liberties, and British liberties took ill with taxed teas.

But before we turn this picture to the wall, let us look a little closer at the collapse of the colonial system in America, and see what its effects were upon Canada, and how Toronto came thereby to be the gainer. A month after the capitulation of Montreal, George the Second was gathered to his fathers, as the historians minutely chronicle, in the seventy-seventh year of

his life and the thirty-fourth of his reign. His page went one morning, as Thackeray tells us, to take him his royal chocolate, and behold! the most religious and gracious sovereign lay dead upon the floor. The intractable monarch who succeeded him took the administration of affairs into his own hands, and though he made a mess of things on this continent, he was not lacking in courage, and, when his mind was clear, would brook little interference from his counsellors. But George III. was unskilled in diplomacy; and having his own headstrong way, he brought humiliation on Britain; and after the lapse of some years a pitiful malady fell upon himself. The period of what is known as the "King's Ministry," extending from 1763 to 1782, covers the eventful era of the War of Independence, in which the colonists of the New World, resenting interference in matters of trade from administrations in London, and feeling that liberty was imperilled by the aggressions of the Crown, threw off allegiance to Britain and founded the government of the United States.

Burke's magnificent plea for conciliation bore no fruit, and the eloquent warnings of Fox and Chatham were wasted on the insolent Lord North. For a time British arms met with their wonted successes, and the hopes of the young nation were far from being elated. Montgomery had fallen at Quebec, and Burgoyne had penetrated from the St. Lawrence to the Hudson, capturing the stronghold of Ticonderoga by the way. Brant and his Indians were carrying terror through the valley of the Mohawk, while New York and the lower Hudson were invested by the fleet of Lord Howe. But while the weary years of the unnatural conflict passed, fickle fortune began to change, and the fates to smile on the arms of the Young Republic. The Royalists met with reverse after reverse, until the end came with the surrender at Saratoga of General Burgoyne, and at Yorktown of Lord Cornwallis. Victory finally resting upon the Continental arms, America achieved her independence and was formally admitted into the category of nations. In this she was no little assisted by Britain's hereditary enemy, France, which nation, on the surrender of Burgoyne, not only hastened to acknowledge the revolted colonies, but sent an army to aid them in their struggle with the common foe. But the capitulation of the British generals was not merely the capitulation of an army; it was the surrender of half of Britain's hold upon the New World and withdrawal from the best part of a continent. To the Loyalist "the lost cause" was freighted with evil, for to him and his it brought woe and desolation. With the success of the colonies came persecution and the loss of property. Then was accepted voluntary expatriation, with its trials and privations, and the sad experiences of exile in the wilderness of Canada.

Much has been written about the United Empire Loyalists, on the one hand in disparagement of their hostile attitude towards the new-born Republic, and on the other, in well-deserved praise of their loyalty to the British Crown. Our own view is, that they made great and undoubted sacrifices in abandoning their homes and possessions for a domicile under the Old Flag. Some of their detractors have gone the length of saying that their devotion to the House of Brunswick had not the merit of being even a sentimental one—that they were actuated by mercenary motives; by party alliance with the administration that had provoked the war; and by a spirit of Tory hostility to the Whigs, who were opposed to coercive measures towards the colonies. But this

is surely an extreme and an unfair view of the matter, and a libel on the memory of these patriots. Party feeling, then as now, no doubt, ran high; and faction was almost certain, in a great issue then pending, to have its followers. But rebellion was a serious alternative; and with men who loved the Old Land and revered the Flag, to renounce the one and be untrue to the other was a step they might well be excused from taking, however impolitic may have been the course of British administration, and unjust the measures forced upon the colony.

On the other hand, it may be asked, were there not excesses indulged in by the partisans of the Republic; covetous eyes laid on the possessions of true men and loyal citizens; and taunts and gibes thrown at those who were known to look coldly upon the successes of the Colonists in revolt, and who loved the land of their birth and honored the home of their kindred? It would not be difficult to prove that this was but too cruelly the case. Haliburton, in his "Rulo and Mirulo of the Eng'lish in America," affirms that "tarring and feathering, and other acts of personal outrage, became so common in Massachusetts, that all suspected partisans of the Mother Country were obliged to seek refuge with the troops." Another authority says: "I could adduce instances of conduct in Loyalists that would do honor to human nature; but there is one which I cannot pass over, because it shows with what firmness men will act when they are conscious that they have taken the right side of a question. A fort was reduced by the Americans on the river Savannah, and such of the loyal militia as were in garrison there had the alternative offered them of enlisting with the Americans, or being put to death. Among the Loyalists was a young man who desired a few minutes to consider the proposal, and after a short pause he resolutely answered that he preferred death to disgrace, on which account he was immediately cut down."

But whatever the actual facts, and however varied the motives that kept the Loyalists from yielding up their fidelity to their king, there can be little question as to the hardships they endured in abandoning their estates in what was comparative civilization for a home in the inhospitable wilds of the trackless forest. Few of their number, it may be, who, for the sake of a principle, had the courage to prefer instant death rather than be untrue to their convictions; though many are known to have taken their chances of life or death with the British troops in the varying fortunes of the war. How many after the close of the conflict preferred expatriation to living in a country that had won independence through rebellion, history is here to attest; and these were the men who were to form the brawn and muscle, the mind and heart, of the new settlements of Acadia and Canada. True, the Loyalists received large gifts of the soil in the new land to which they had come, as some compensation for their losses; but these grants were such as any class of settlers would be likely to receive, under any politic system of immigration. And as to the money appropriation by the Crown on their behalf, in view of what work lay before them, as pioneers of a new and unopened country, and deprived as they were of almost every thing their previous toil had secured to them, no generous mind will cavil at, or say that, considering their need, it was not richly their due.

With the peace of 1763, which the Treaty of Versailles secured, lands of Loyalists entered Canada from various points, and settled in the neighborhood of Niagara, round the shores of Lake Ontario, up the Bay of Quinte, down the St. Lawrence, and