

America have, through this establishment, been given to the reading public. Profound essays from scientists, philosophers, and theologians have been printed and sent out with their messages of instruction to the multitude. Charming stories, blending fact and fiction, have been sent forth by river and rail to teach and turn the minds of the masses towards the cause which is the handmaid of Christianity. To have built such a business in the face of ebb-tide and head wind is certainly a marvellous achievement."

Contributed.

SCOTT ACT ENFORCEMENT. (Continued.)

SECOND ARTICLE.

BY REV. D. L. BRETHOUR.

One of the difficulties that will be met at the very beginning, is the want of sympathy of some of the leading citizens of the town and county. Indeed, more than that, in some cases, their opposition. The ground of this opposition will be found to be of a varied character.

Some will say they were always opposed to the Scott Act, and though it is law, will give it no encouragement. Others will oppose the law because they say it is unjust, a tyranny, and an interference with a man's personal liberty. Others will give the law no sympathy because they do not believe in a local option law at all, but are in favor of general prohibition. And others still deny it because they are opposed to all prohibitory laws, whether local or general. Temperance men must not be deterred from the work of enforcement by opposition of the above kind, but must be prepared for it. It is no just ground for opposition to the Scott Act because a man does not believe in it. Suppose the temperance men opposed the Crooks Act and obstructed its enforcement because they did not believe in the justice of any license law at all, what would be said of them? They would receive and deserve severe condemnation. There are certain publishers of newspapers in Toronto City, at present, who say they do not believe in the Sunday law prohibiting the publishing and selling of newspapers on the Sabbath day, and they will not respect the Sabbath law. Are they justified in it? Can they put themselves into opposition to the Sabbath laws of the country and be guiltless? Can they reasonably claim to be good citizens of this our Commonwealth and so act as to bring the law into contempt? Neither can an opponent of the Scott Act aid in any way the opposition to its enforcement in any county, without leaving himself open to serious suspicion. But, they say, this law is peculiar, it is not like any other law, and therefore we may oppose its enforcement and not be guilty of wrong against society. I admit the law is peculiar, and because of that peculiarity its claim for respect and obedience is all the stronger. The man who opposes the enforcement of this law, opposes the will of the people, lawfully expressed at the ballot-box.

Temperance people must remember that there has been a systematic education in the line of the violation of liquor laws for many years. In the Report of Tavern and Shop Licenses, for the year 1884, for Ontario, I find that fines were collected during the year for violation of the Crooks Act to the amount of \$21,406.32. This does not look like obedience to law. If men will not observe a strict license law like the Crooks Act, need we be surprised if an attempt will be made to violate the Scott Act. Mr. Dexter, one of the License Inspectors for the City of Toronto, said on the 17th ult., at a meeting of the Board of License Commissioners for that city, that "In nine years he had prosecuted 2,757 cases, and the fines derived from this source amounted to \$33,322." He stated further "that in the billiard and pool rooms of the city large quantities of liquor were sold." (*Globe* Report.) Is there not a wholesale education going on in law-breaking? If the grocers or dry-goods merchants, or any other class of business men, violated the laws governing their trades as the liquor traffic does, how much character do you suppose they would have left? No one complains because of this that the Crooks Act is a fraud, and should be repealed.

But there is one other fact connected with this education in law-breaking which is worthy of serious remark. Within the last twelve months in many counties in this Province of Ontario, Anti-Scott Act lecturers have taught the people from the public platform, that if the Crooks Act were broken, it was not the fault of the liquor-sellers, but of the Inspectors—the

officers appointed to enforce the law. And with reference to the Scott Act it was said repeatedly that the law was a tyranny and should not be respected. What can we expect from teaching of this kind, but men educated to think it is clever to evade the law and escape detection. The reasons why the Scott Act should be enforced are very many and very strong. It has been tried as very few laws have been tried. It became law in 1878 by common and united consent of both political parties in the House of Commons. Then it was sent to the Supreme Court, and was pronounced constitutional. Next it was sent to the Privy Council, and the highest court of the Empire declared it was no violation of a British freeman's rights to vote on and pass the Scott Act in any county or city in Canada. The Right Honorable W. H. Gladstone said, during a debate two years ago on Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Local Option resolution, when it was before the House of Commons, "The just and reasonable measure of my friend, Sir Wilfrid Lawson," and at the same time, with most of the members of his Government, voted for it. Sir Wilfrid Lawson's bill is very like our own Scott Act. The man who says it is a tyranny, does not well understand what he is saying. No British freeman's rights are interfered with either by the passing of, or enforcing the Scott law. The plea was made by some members in the House of Commons, during the recent discussion on Mr. Jamieson's bill to amend the Scott Act, that in no county did a majority of the electors vote for the Act, and therefore it did not represent the majority of public opinion. The license law of Ontario says that a young lad, having come to the mature age of sixteen years, is a fit and proper person to buy liquor and drink it in a bar-room. The law presumes he is old enough to decide for himself and judge as to what he should do, at least in this matter. If the law puts a lad of sixteen years of age in this position, should his opinion not be worth something about the propriety of shutting up the grog-shops entirely? Take the tens of thousands in all the homes of the land—mothers, daughters and sons—who have no votes, but who are opposed to the liquor traffic, and add them to the voters who have already declared against the liquor crime, and you will have a majority of public sentiment that would drive into hiding forever any other trade having less of the demon spirit in it than the liquor trade. The license laws of every country offer a standing invitation to young lads of sixteen years of age to become disobedient to their parents. The mother teaches her boy that the drinking customs of the country are wrong, the bar-room is an immoral place, and whoever goes within its influence cannot escape stain and injury, but the law says the barkeeper may sell to a boy sixteen years of age, and the custom of drinking is legal, and therefore many say right. Here is a conflict in the mind of the boy. The mother says it is wrong to go to bar-rooms and form the drinking habit, but the law says it is not wrong. I charge the liquor license laws with being enemies of the homes of our people, and encouraging disobedience to parents. Can any right-thinking man, who intelligently understands what he is doing, be either indifferent to, or oppose the enforcement of an Act, whose sole aim is to strengthen the authority of the home, drive out of existence a business that has been mis-educating the people of this country for more than half a century, and forever destroy the legal power and right to debauch men through their appetite for strong drink.

Let temperance men everywhere educate the people by lecture, and book, and tract, on the platform, in the pulpit, and by the press, to stand by this law and use every honest endeavor to enforce it.

Milton, May, 1885.

Facts and Opinions.

A Healthy Town.

The long-sought-for Utopia, evidently exists in New England, the little town of Dennyville, in Maine. For sixteen years not one inhabitant between the age of one and twenty has died there, not a drop of liquor has been sold for the same period, and no fire has occurred for sixty years. There is no railroad near, so that Dennyville remains in a state of perfect simplicity.—*Graphic*.

It Works.

Des Moines, the capital city of Iowa, which one year ago had sixty saloons, paying \$60,000 into the city treasury, now has not a single open dram-shop. One saloon-keeper who predicted that the law would be a failure has to-day a fine of \$1,750 hanging over him, and he has quit the business. That the enforcement of the law has become an issue in municipal as well as state politics, is evidenced by the fact that at the recent city election "enforcement" candidates were elected in nearly every ward.—*Union Signal*.