

We are rapidly piling up evidence that these requirements have been met. Let us carefully guard against any pretexts for further procrastination.

ORGANIZE.

We wish to again strongly urge upon our friends in the different counties the necessity for a thorough organization. We have no doubt about our ability to win in nearly every contest that is coming on, but we want large majorities. We want majorities that will preclude any attempt to worry us with repeal agitation, and majorities that will strengthen us in our immediate demand for prohibition.

This struggle is one that ought to enlist the sympathy of every patriot, that ought to command the support of every Christian. We shall win, but we want for the sake of our holy cause and our suffering humanity to win effectually and permanently. We cannot spare a single vote; we must not leave a stone unturned. "Every man" must do his duty, but there is special need for the co-operation of those who can aid in perfecting organization and working out campaign details. Let no polling sub-division be without its earnest persistent canvassing committee, working incessantly, but prayerfully and prudently; let no voter be left uncanvassed, but let him be canvassed by the right persons; and before polling day comes, let the arrangements be as complete as possible for gathering into the ballot box the harvest for which we are now sowing the seed. Let everybody work, and let organization be perfect.

THE LIQUOR PARTY AND THE SCOTT ACT.

Some articles have recently appeared in the *Toronto World* giving to the public the opinions and feelings of the liquor business, in reference to the Scott Act agitation, and the present position of the prohibitory movement. We presume the *World* speaks authoritatively; it professes to give the views of "those in the business," and for the information of our readers we reprint in another column some extracts from the articles to which we have alluded.

The first point to be noticed in these utterances is, that the liquor men admit—in fact, bitterly complain—that the Scott Act movement is "ruining their business." We have been hearing for a long time that "prohibition does not prohibit," that more liquor would be drunk under Scott Act than under license, and in the different counties orators had been telling the people that Maine is a drunken State, that Halton is a drunken county, that laws for the suppression of liquor-selling always lead to increased liquor drinking; and the license system was pleaded for "in the interests of temperance and morality." Now all this is changed; anti-orators have discovered that an intelligent electorate cannot be misled by such palpable misrepresentations; Maine and Halton by overwhelming majorities have declared their abiding faith in the laws they have tested, and without a moment's hesitation, the erstwhile advocates of "true temperance" drop the tattered disguise of a pretended philanthropy, come out unblushingly with a full avowal of the inherent selfishness of their real motives and plead for license because prohibition prohibits and the Scott Act is a grand success. They cry out that "their business is falling away, that those in the wholesale trade say that they can collect nothing from customers in counties where the Scott Act will soon be submitted, and they have to pay heavy and frequent levies in order to fight the agitators, and prevent their business being extinguished."

We are fighting the liquor traffic only. We bear no ill-will to the men engaged in the unholy business. We should be sorry to be found exulting over the wail of beaten adversaries, or glorying in the exposure of their sordid hypocrisy. We simply desire to call the attention of the public to the fact of their utter abandonment of the plea that the Scott Act is a failure, and their unwilling but emphatic endorsement of all that we have claimed as to the efficiency of prohibitory legislation.

We desire also to call attention to the "complaint of the distillers, brewers and wholesale dealers that the tavern-keepers and retail men are not willing to contribute a fair share towards fighting the agitation." This fully bears out what we have argued before—that this is not the hotelkeepers fight; that many of these men recognize that the license system is antagonistic to their interests and a serious drawback and curse to their legitimate occupation. Hotel-keeping is a useful and honorable business, and there is no sound reason for associating it with the disreputable calling of the rum-seller upon which public opprobrium is steadily, certainly and deservedly settling down. Besides this, the manufacturers have been making the lion's share of the profits of the business, while the retail dealers have been bearing the principal part of the odium and contempt, and the better class of them are getting sick of being used as cats-paws to drag the brewers' chestnuts out of the fire, and would much prefer doing a respectable and respected business under prohibition, such as they cannot do under the license system which forces upon them the competition of every man who wants a license to sell whiskey.

It is not strange that these men decline to furnish funds for the campaign that is being conducted against their interests and for the benefit of the metropolitan capitalists, who are building up large fortunes and palatial residences, seemingly regardless of the indisputable fact that their enrichment must mean the impoverishment of the community at large.

Two proposals are made by the liquor men. One is that they should be compensated for the pecuniary loss they will sustain through prohibition. With this we propose to deal in another article. The other is a "claim that until the matter of jurisdiction in relation to the liquor interest is settled, the agitation ought to be stopped by an Act of the Dominion Parliament suspending the Scott Act."

We must confess to inability to see how the conflict between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments about the licensing question can be a reason for interfering with the Scott Act in the manner proposed. The liquor business is not suffering from the contest. Liquor penalties are less rigidly exacted, more licenses are issued and more liquor is sold on account of the unsettled state of this question. The liquor traffic is the gainer by the controversy, and the temporary relaxation of license law is surely no reason for suspending the operation of another good law. There is no question as to the constitutionality of the Scott Act, and there is more reason than before for its enactment and enforcement. A trespassing cow is ravaging a farmer's garden, and he is urged to cease all efforts to drive her out, because his two little girls are disputing as to which of them would have the best right to milk her if she were permitted to remain. We are actually told that we ought to sit still and see the incendiary fire our homes, because two men are quarreling about the exclusive privilege of supplying him with torches. The seriousness of the question ought to keep such childishness out of its discussion.

A curious forecast is made as to the future of the liquor business and the prohibitory movement, a forecast containing so much