

purposes, in future we shall lop off the superfluous words and call it the *Anti*. We think this word embraces all its significance. It is against everything that is high, noble and of good repute. It is against the amelioration of half the woes which mankind suffer from. It is against the progress of Christianity. It is against the promotion of sobriety. It is against the welfare of the State and the individual. It is against the peace of wife and child, of father and mother, of son and daughter. It is over against the fallacies of prohibition; although a compendium of fallacies in itself. These we may deal with from time to time as the *Anti* may reach us.

The *Anti* is greatly afraid of the coercion by that "accidental majority of voters which may at the final struggle command a majority at the polls." Accidental majority is a good way to put it a few months ahead of the poll. It shows who is afraid of the right and the result. But our little contemporary desires to be just and fearless. Having carefully "weighed both sides of the question, it has been forced to the conclusion that the Scott Act is an unjust and tyrannical invasion of the liberties of the people." Just think of it! The *Anti* weighing both sides! We see them in imagination putting the tears of the widow and orphan in one measure with the cost to the nation in crime and the destruction of property by the victims of the traffic; the waste of food material; the expenses of gaols, lunatics and police. On the other side they dump in the selfishness of a few moderate drinkers, clothed in a few well worn sophistries stolen from a popular clothing store called the "Liberties of the people." But that is not enough, so they pop in their own enormous profits, and the fact that numbers of them would have to turn to and work for their daily bread. Down goes the scale on their side and up goes the other. Thus have they weighed both sides of this question. How could an impartial verdict be obtained when the jury and the criminal are one?

This is only one fallacy for the repudiation of fallacies. There are more to be dealt with again.—*Chatham Tribune*.

THE SCOTT ACT.

We have all along, during the progress of the temperance movement that has been spreading over Ontario, been studying out the merits of the cause with as much precision as was possible with the resources and under the circumstances and surroundings that are at hand. We have been aware, for some time, that the Scott Act, or Canada Temperance Act, was to be submitted to a vote in Lanark County, provided a petition to that end received sufficient endorsement. We believe that such a petition would to-day receive such support simply on its merits as a temperance manifesto. It is true that there are many ways of looking at the subject—every one, perhaps, who reasons out the matter for himself may have some standpoint of his own, from which to view it, or to him may be presented some integral phase of the temperance question. Many will argue, without regard for the merits of the Scott Act, that, simply because it is a measure for temperance, it must be a good undertaking, and with this argument in its broad sense, we agree, but then the anti-temperance element, bound together by its own ties of strength and self-organization, will meet that point by a proposition which is, to its adherents, of equally positive force—*viz.*, that temperance is more favorably carried into effect under the present restrictive License Act than it could be by a prohibitive measure. Upon this argument—for such is the argument of the liquor interests—we may be allowed to speak. In the first place, to revert to the broad principle of temperance (that is, the principle opposed to intoxicants), can it be proven to the electors that the liquor traffic is of benefit to either the local community or to the Province? We say it cannot, and that, on the contrary, it is a means of both social and commercial depreciation. Why is there a "license" charge put upon the traffic? Is it for the purpose of raising a revenue, or is it for the purpose of restricting the general use of alcoholic beverages? The answer of the liquor interests is, "It is for both purposes." Well, as to the raising of revenue, it is a fact beyond contradiction, as has been witnessed in every district where the Scott Act has been enforced, that the revenue that was lost by the abolition of the public liquor traffic has not been one half as large as the amount gained by the public exchequer from decreased expenditure on account of the absence of drunken crime. This is no sentimental statement,

but a positive fact than can be substantiated by the public records. Therefore, the liquor traffic is not licensed for revenue. It must be that the license fee is placed upon the sale of liquor in order to check the general use thereof, and this, of course, is evidence to all that its social effect is injurious. This brings one to the question as to whether it is advisable for the electors to use their power in an attempt to remove a social evil by the means that is granted them by the Government for that purpose. Just here we would say that we think there are some temperance advocates who dispose of this question in an irrational manner by condemning and even abusing the men who conduct trade under the Liquor License Act. This in no way helps the temperance cause. While the liquor trade is legally licensed, let such, as a constituted act of law, be regarded as the people's permissive will. The Scott Act is now the instrument constitutionally placed in the hands of the people for the expression of their wills as to license or no license. We think that, to place the question fairly before the people, the simple, straight and satisfactory solution is: Temperance people should and will support the Scott Act; those who oppose temperance will not vote for it. At the same time, it would be well for every voter to study the matter carefully, and become fully acquainted with the Scott Act in all its bearings. The main thing for the temperance people to obtain is a prohibitive measure that can be enforced.—*Carleton Place Herald*

THE AUDACITY OF UNTRUTH.

There is a final declaration which all friends of the liquor traffic make use of when arguments fail—"Prohibition does not prohibit." Last week the *Albany Evening Journal* and the *Philadelphia Record* repeated it, and besides these, we suppose, a score or two of lesser political authorities. The declaration is made with no real knowledge of, or no honest regard for, the truth. It is made in the face of contrary testimony which would convince any impartial court and satisfy any jury honestly drawn. It is made deliberately, and as deliberately reiterated, in columns wherein this opposing testimony finds place. It must be made for the one purpose of stopping the application of a great principle by prejudicing masses of men against it as ineffective. What are the facts?

Take Maine, for that state is always cited when the enemies of prohibition assail prohibitory law—as Dio Lewis lately cited it. Take the chief cities of Maine, for it is these which are specially singled out for derogatory reference. In Portland there are 33,810 population, and the ratio of liquor sellers to the population in New York State, also in New Jersey, would give 187 in that city. The U. S. Revenue returns show 156—31 short of the quota; all by the vigilance of government detectives reported, and all selling more or less secretly. But Portland is the main source of supply for all Cumberland County, there are but sixteen dealers in that county outside the city; and this being the fact, we have but 172 dealers for 83,360 people, whereas New York State would call for a quota of 463. In the adjoining county of Oxford there are but five liquor dealers for 32,618 people, and Portland is the natural source of supply for at least half that county, giving a total of 177 dealers, where in New York and New Jersey we should have 531.

In Lewiston and Auburn, with a population of 28,639, there are 57 persons, including druggists, who paid the U. S. tax the past year, yet there is not a single open dram-shop in those cities, whereas a like population in New York would call for 159. In the whole fourteen cities of Maine, with a population of 144,863, there were last year but 493 secret and open dealers, including about 150 druggists, who paid U. S. tax, or one to about every 300 inhabitants; whereas in sixty license cities of other states there was one dealer to every 155 inhabitants, all selling openly, and each selling, on an average, at least twice as much liquor as his law-defying brother dealer in Maine.

So much for the cities. In the entire state there were 813 dealers last year, including nearly 300 druggists, so called, because they paid the U. S. tax, which no secret dealer escapes or evades. Taken altogether, they counted but one to every 800 inhabitants, and all these, excepting the druggists, who did not sell for beverage purposes, as a rule, were secret dealers outside of seventeen places, all selling at the greatest possible disadvantage, and as a rule selling little. In 420 towns and plantations of the state there is but one dealer to every 2,000 inhabitants, and the revenue returns show that in 355 towns and plantations there was last year not a single dealer to pay the tax. Furthermore three mills, while in the entire union,