

That the treachery of the Senate may be clearly understood, it must be borne in mind that the Scott Act, as it now stands, (as far as its prohibitory clauses are concerned) was ratified by this same Senate, and passed over to the people of Canada as a measure to enable them to protect themselves against the terrible evils of drink. The public of Canada have gone to work in good faith, and by energetic efforts have secured the adoption of the Scott Act in fifty-nine counties and cities. In many of these the Act is just going into operation. In many more counties work for its adoption has been commenced, and now after giving the people the power to prohibit the liquor traffic, after the people have taken advantage of this privilege, and prohibited the liquor traffic, the Senate, in the interests of the liquor party, not merely goes back on its own former record, but actually proposes to disallow by a vote of 42 members the legislation that the people have adopted by a majority of about 45,000.

If this amendment really became law, the Scott Act would not be worth working for, and temperance men would at once drop all agitation for its adoption and enforcement. The state of affairs would be vastly worse than under any license system; for under license law only a few persons are permitted to sell any kind of strong drink, while the result of the Senate's proposal, if it became law, would be to allow every person who chooses, to engage, unrestrained in the business of selling wine and beer.

We believe, however, that the smallness and contemptibleness of the Senate's action is not apparent at first sight in the above facts. The action taken cannot become law until ratified by a vote of the House of Commons. That House dare not insult public sentiment, as the irresponsible Senate presumes to do; and there is no probability that the proposed changes will really become a part of the Scott Act. At the present time there are coming on, a good many Scott Act contests in different counties. But the proposed action of the Senate is calculated to weaken the confidence, in the Scott Act, of some people who do not see through the trick, and temperance men thinking that the Scott Act is likely to be spoiled, may be deceived into refraining from active exertions in its behalf, that they would otherwise have made. The senators who supported the amendment knew perfectly well that this amendment will not become law, and it is hard to believe that they have seriously engaged in anything more than a paltry trick to help the whiskey party to defeat the temperance men in the forthcoming elections.

The whiskey traffic, and the men who support it, will fail in their efforts. Temperance men will stand by their law, by their colors, and by their cause. The Scott Act will win in the contests coming on, in other contests to follow, and its results will bless our Dominion long after we have forgotten the names of the men who are now proving such traitors to the interests of justice and morality.

The hearty thanks of every temperance man in the community are due to Hon. Messrs. Vidal, Scott, Flint, Alexander and Wark, for the able manner in which they resisted this iniquitous proposal.

#### SCOTT ACT ENFORCEMENT.

The immediate imperative duty of the friends of the cause in Scott Act counties, is thorough organization for the enforcement of the law. The Scott Act went into operation on May 1st in thirteen additional counties; before that date it was in force in twenty-six counties and two cities; so that it is now the law of forty-one counties and cities. It has also been carried in sixteen counties and two cities in which it does not come into force till May 1st, 1856. A great many more counties are getting ready to vote; and the vote in these will be largely influenced by the success or failure of the law in other places. It is essential, therefore,—not only for the sake

of the good that the Scott Act will immediately accomplish, but also for the sake of the effect its success will have upon the coming elections—that we secure a vigorous enforcement of the law.

We do not believe that it should be necessary to have private citizens undertake the duties of government officials; but when the latter fail to do their whole duty, we owe it to our cause at the present juncture to supplement ordinary means by all right extraordinary means within our reach. Rev. D. L. Brethour, who has seen a good deal of Scott Act working in Halton has kindly undertaken to write for us a series of articles on this important question. The first of these will be found below, and we strongly recommend it to our readers.

#### Contributed.

#### SCOTT ACT ENFORCEMENT.

##### I.—LET OUR LAWS BE RIGHT.

BY REV. D. L. BRETHOUR.

SIR,—As the Scott Act came into force in nine counties in the Province of Ontario and two in Quebec on the 1st day of May, some words on the law and its enforcement will not be unwelcome to many of your readers. The sooner the temperance people realize that it is one thing to carry the Scott Act in a county by popular vote, and quite another thing to enforce it after it has been carried, the better. Entirely too many cease all effort after the Act has been passed, and let the enforcement take care of itself. Many are weakened by the cry that "there is no use putting a law on our statute books if you cannot enforce it," and conclude the Scott Act cannot be enforced, declaring it unwise to attempt it.

Granting for a moment (for the sake of argument only) that the Act cannot be enforced, is it wise to pass it? It seems to me there is a question which takes precedence, and that is, "Is the law right that prohibits the common traffic in intoxicating drinks?" Will any one say that no law should be put upon the statute books unless it is enforced? To say that is to say that every law that is not enforced should at once be repealed. A law may have a preponderance of public sentiment in its favor and not be well enforced, but any effort to repeal it would be vigorously and successfully resisted. Let anyone try to repeal the Sunday law and he will have an example of what I mean. The question is "Is the law right?" There are many indications very manifest in the Dominion to-day that public sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of all laws in the direction of a larger curtailment of the powers and privileges of the liquor traffic to work mischief, and of its complete prohibition. And yet it may be that in some localities in the counties where the Scott Act came in force on May 1st, the law may be imperfectly enforced for a time. It is the duty of the Government to make the law right. It is the duty of the people to see that their rulers do it. It is easier to educate public opinion with the law on your side than with the law against you. The law itself is a great educational power. For an illustration of the educational power of law, look at the license laws. See how they have educated public opinion—wrongly, it is true, but the work has been done. Had not the law protected the liquor traffic and taken a revenue from it, it is almost certain the idea that alcohol is useful as a beverage would not have taken hold of the public mind as deeply as it has done. In the education for the enforcement of prohibitory legislation public opinion must be corrected and saved from the errors taught it by license laws in the direction of the use of liquor, both as a beverage and as medicine as commonly prescribed. The law should never be on the side of the wrong-doer.

One of the proper functions of law is to make it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong. It is monstrous that a man should appeal to law to protect him in a business that does wrong to his brother; and more monstrous still that he should be protected. In a city in this Province there lives a mother whose only son was made a drunkard in one of the saloons of that city. She knew it not until the ruin was wrought. The outraged motherhood within her rose in rebellion against the institution of a licensed liquor traffic. It was unjust that her son should be destroyed by a demon