

Monied wire-pullers, irresponsible Senators, barn-burners, home-desecrators, drunkard-makers, are not able to stop the onward march of moral reform. The good sense of the Canadian public will prove more than a match for the prejudices of would-be legislators; the warm heart and sound morality of our young community will overcome the cupidity, heartlessness and cunning of brewers and distillers; and the fiendishness of slanderers and fire-brands will be dealt with by the strong hand of relentless justice. It must, however, be distinctly understood that it will not be enough that tools and accomplices only are punished, while the greater criminals go free. If ordinary police agencies will not suffice for the securing of justice, there must and will be such extraordinary organization as will make this country too hot for such scoundrels as have recently been at work in Kincairdine.

A THIRD PARTY.

We publish, in another column, a letter from an earnest temperance advocate, who feels justly indignant at the evident unwillingness of either of our present party leaders to deal straightforwardly and courageously with the prohibition question. Our correspondent favors an immediate and definite independent political organization with prohibition as the main plank of its platform, believing that such a movement would command the support of prohibition voters to an extent sufficient to make it presently influential and ultimately triumphant.

We believe that the liquor traffic is the most dangerous enemy that to-day wages war against society, and that its prohibition would be the greatest political blessing that could be given to our country. The question for temperance reformers to consider is simply this: What is the best means of attaining that end? If prohibition can be secured most speedily and effectually through either or both of the existing political parties, by all means let us avoid anything that would prevent the accomplishment of that result; but if prohibition can only be secured by a third party, let us have a third party at once.

The time is rapidly drawing near when this question must be settled. The Senate amendment (?) will be considered in the House of Commons. The attitude assumed towards that amendment, by leaders and parties, will show temperance workers what are the prospects of success on present lines and with present methods, and will go far in determining our future action.

Many loyal friends of our cause are anxious to avoid any disruption of their present political connections, and would prefer victory through the adoption by Government of a consistent prohibitive policy in harmony with clearly expressed public opinion,—a policy that would have the support of the best men on both sides of the House of Commons. But these men are true to the temperance reform, and if they cannot win as they would, then they will win as they must.

BEATEN.

The liquor men have been thoroughly beaten in the field of public controversy and fairly driven off the platform of public debate.

County after county is being carried for the Scott Act, but no advocate is sent out to oppose it as of yore. What is the reason? The funds of the whiskey power are not all spent; they have plenty of cash for certain purposes. It can hardly be that the crowd of stumpers, who recently swarmed into every contest, have refused to take the money, and do the work for which they were lately so eager. No! The men are still available, the money is still on hand, but the anti-Scott wire-pullers have learned by sad experience that there are in our Canadian communities intelligence and discernment enough to see through and despise the miserable falsehoods and

sophistries that were retailed as facts and arguments by anti-Scott Act orators.

Besides this, Canadian audiences love fair play, they insist upon free discussion, and the liquor men dare not allow free discussion, knowing that it must invariably ruin their weak and immoral cause.

"He that doeth evil hateth the light." We ask our readers to consider carefully the fact that the liquor men dread and evade the light that fair and free investigation always sheds. They have not withdrawn their advocates through mortification at their ignominious failure, as some of these were ready to bear the humiliation of constant defeat for the sake of the fees received. They have simply given up all platform work, because platform discussion enlightens and instructs, and enlightenment and instruction are deadly foes to the unholy traffic in intoxicating drink.

We congratulate the Canadian people upon the fact that this liquor power dreads their intelligence and power, and is driven to a policy of contemptible trickery, seeking by smuggled legislation to thwart the public will, and cheat our electors out of the righteous law for which they have worked and voted.

Contributed.

To the Editor of THE CANADA CITIZEN,

SIR,—Now that the Senate has emasculated the Scott Act, and the Commons are likely to adopt the amendments, there are indications of a general uprising among the friends of prohibition, regardless of party allegiance.

This uprising threatens to be one of the most powerful and demonstrative that Canada has ever witnessed.

The tacit pledge that was given by Parliament years ago, and the distinct promise repeated in the house of Commons last session, have put the friends of the movement everywhere throughout the Dominion, but especially in Ontario, on the alert.

Now that so much time, energy and money, have been expended in carrying the Scott Act in the counties, those who have borne the brunt of the battle are determined not to be deceived or delayed in the accomplishment of their purpose.

There is little doubt that a pledge was given secretly by the Government during the winter to the liquor party. If any proof were wanting of this, the fact of the division in the Senate on party lines, together with the fact that Sir Alexander Campbell, a member of the ministry, and the talked-off successor to Sir John Macdonald, introduced the measure in the Senate, are evidence that should be satisfactory to any unprejudiced person.

With the passage of the amendments in the Commons,—which, to my mind, is a foregone conclusion,—there should be, and I trust will be, a pronounced demonstration by the prohibitionists.

Every man who votes for the emasculation of the Scott Act, and for annulling the efforts of the past years in the direction of prohibition should be a marked man. It is not sufficient that he should be called to account by his constituents for his conduct. No explanation that he could offer should be accepted as satisfactory, but both Grit and Tory prohibitionists should unite against him and support a candidate who could be relied upon to vote solid on all prohibition questions.

We are on the eve of an entirely new phase of the agitation, and however much the old party men may desire to cling to their allegiance, they will be forced to come out squarely on the prohibition platform, regardless of party.

What will force them? The conviction that neither of the present political parties will give us what we ask. The action of the party now in power is proof enough that they have chosen to identify their interests with those of the liquor party. The Reform party, on the other hand, has coquetted with the prohibitionists, but it is well known, Mr. Blake, though personally sympathetic, would not assume the responsibility of making the total prohibition of the liquor traffic a plank in the platform of the party of which he is leader.

The young men who are now in the prohibition movement care little for party. They are far more interested in the success of