

The Dominion Council of the Alliance will meet at Ottawa, on the 5th and 6th of February. Delegates to this convention are elected by the Branches of the Alliance in the different provinces. Those who are entitled to attend this meeting may obtain certificates entitling them to reduced railway fares, by applying to the Secretary, F. S. Spence, 8 King Street East, Toronto.

A Scott-Act prayer and praise meeting will be held at the office of THE CANADA CITIZEN, 8 King St. East, Toronto, on the 15th inst., to receive reports from the held of battle and assist the workers by our prayers.

POLLINGS FIXED.

REMEMBER THE WORKERS IN YOUR PRAYERS.

Kent.....	Jan. 15	Brome.....	Jan. 15
Lanark.....	Jan. 15	Guelph.....	Jan. 22
Lennox and Addington..	Jan. 15	Carleton.....	Jan. 29

STICKING TO A LIE.

Some time ago the Anti-Scott Act party invented and circulated the statement that under the Scott Act the consumption of whiskey in Prince Edward Island had increased. This fabrication was promptly exposed, but it has lately been re-iterated by some Anti-Scott papers, and along with it have been quoted, statistics purporting to be in comparison of the amounts of drink consumed before and after the adoption of the Act. In these comparisons, the drink figures of Prince Edward Island for 1883 are placed beside figures for a year long before the Scott Act was adopted, a year in which the drink consumption throughout the Dominion was remarkably low. The fact is entirely ignored that since the coming into operation of the Scott Act, the drink consumption has steadily decreased, as the following statement clearly shows:—

The Scott Act was passed by the Dominion Parliament in the early part of 1878, and after its adoption it came into operation in the different parts of P.E.I. as follows:—in Prince county May 1st, 1879; in Charlottetown and King's county May 1st, 1880; and in Queen's county May 1st, 1881. The Government returns are for years ending on the 30th of June in the respective years named. The total amount of home-manufactured and imported spirits that were entered for home consumption in P. E. I., during the latest five years for which we have returns, is shown in the following table:—

Year....	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.
Quantity.	62,100.	58,832.	51,665.	47,008.	45,894.

The year 1880 was the first in which the Scott Act was even nominally in operation in any part of the Province. We are not surprised at the misstatements of some people who are ever ready to distort facts and slander their fellow-countrymen for the sake of perpetuating the vile business by which they are enriching themselves; but we are surprised to find some reputedly respectable journals lend themselves to the propagation of such a palpable lie.

SCOTT ACT AND DUNKIN ACT.

A very erroneous impression prevails, especially in the County of York and other places where the Dunkin Act was passed, that because the Dunkin Act did not fulfil the expectations of its advocates, therefore the Scott Act is not any better and should not be carried. This is a mistake, because the provisions of the two Acts are so different that while the Dunkin Act proved to be not very practicable, its defects are remedied by the Scott Act so far as is possible, in any measure not giving absolute prohibition. We shall

endeavor to show the principal defects in the Dunkin Act and the remedy supplied by the Scott Act.

1. Under the Dunkin Act the votes in each municipality were all polled at one place and the voting continued for several days. Frequently, as in Toronto, roughs kept the polling place crowded nearly all the time; many were thereby prevented from recording their votes and business was demoralized for several days. Under the Scott Act, sec. 13, there is to be a polling sub-division for every 200 voters and sec. 9 indicates that the votes are all to be taken in one day.

2. When the Dunkin Act came into force any person could sell liquor in quantities of not less than 5 gallons or 12 bottles, for beverage purposes in any shop or store. The Scott Act entirely prohibits the sale for beverage purposes in any place where the Act is in force. Sec. 99.

3. There was no person appointed by law upon whom specially devolved the duty of enforcing the Dunkin Act. Under the Scott Act, sec. 124, sub-sec. 2, the municipality is not only authorized but commanded to set apart a certain sum for a fund to secure prosecutions under the Act. By sec. 102, the Collector of Inland Revenue is bound to prosecute all cases which come to his knowledge. It is also provided that the Inspectors under the Crooks Act and the McCarthy Act shall enforce the Scott Act. Again the magistrate is authorized to grant search warrants as to suspected places. Generally speaking also as to evidence, trials, &c., prosecutions are not hampered as they were under the Dunkin Act.

4. The penalties under the Dunkin Act were so slight as to render the Act almost a dead letter, not less than \$20 or more than \$50 for any offence, however frequently it occurred. The Scott Act has proved itself workable in this respect, to the great disgust of the tavern keepers in Halton, some of whom know what it is to languish in durance vile as law breakers. (We learn they are now taking steps to rid themselves of the prosecutors.) By sec. 100 the penalties are not less than \$50 for the first offence, not less than \$100 for the second offence, and imprisonment for not more than two months for the third and each subsequent offence; also the liquor is forfeited on conviction. These penalties have already taught the tavern keepers who attempted to defy the law that where the Dunkin Act was weak the Scott Act is strong and effectual and proves an insuperable barrier to the sale of liquor as a beverage.

5. The Dunkin Act could be carried in any place even so small as a township. The Scott Act can only be carried in cities and counties and therefore is more general and comprehensive in its operation.

6. Questions were continually arising as to whether or not the Dunkin Act would be sustained if convictions were carried to appeal. All doubts as to the constitutionality of the Scott Act have been set at rest by the appeal to the Privy Council, of Great Britain when it was decided that the Act is law and must be enforced.

7. A repeal vote on the Dunkin Act could be taken within a year. Under the Scott Act, sec. 97, three years must elapse before it is tested on a repeal vote, thereby giving a better opportunity to prove its efficiency.

In conclusion we may say that the best argument in favor of the Scott Act as compared with the Dunkin Act is the fact that the Scott Act is being practically worked out in many places, and wherever it has been brought up again on a repeal vote it has been confirmed. The more the people know of it the better they like it. There are many minor points of superiority of the Scott Act over the Dunkin Act which we have not mentioned, but the above will serve to show that the Scott Act was framed with the faults of the Dunkin Act in view. Those faults were carefully avoided, and we now have a law which can be worked out as successfully as almost any law on our statute books.