

there have been 31 Scott Act contests; in 26 of these the temperance party has won. A great many members now sit for Scott Act constituencies, who did not represent Scott Act constituencies at the time named, and the public are anxious to know how many of these gentlemen have modified their views. The public also want to know the opinions of some representatives whose votes were not recorded upon that occasion. In short, we want to know where Parliament stands upon the question. The House ought to be divided upon the policy of immediate prohibition at every session of Parliament, until prohibition has become an accomplished fact.

Prohibition must be attained by one of three methods. It may be attained by the united, determined action of temperance representatives, regardless of political differences. This would be the simplest, speediest and most effective plan. Now is the time for such joint-determined action. We have enough temperance men in the House of Commons to force upon that House, and carry through that House, legislation in favor of this great reform if they would only stand together and do it. We are now outside of Parliament doing our duty, doing all that is in our immediate power, strengthening the hands of our Parliamentary friends, and still further developing the already overwhelming public sentiment in our favor. Our friends in Parliament ought to do the same, and the temperance men of the country will be dissatisfied if these representatives do not appreciate and act up to the responsibilities of their position.

If this line of action is not taken, another plan open to temperance workers is the union of forces outside Parliament, and the throwing of the united strength of the temperance electorate into the ranks of whichever existing party will soonest and most strongly come out with prohibition as a part of its policy.

If neither of the plans indicated succeeds—that is, if the men who now represent temperance people do not speedily recognize and act definitely in reference to the pressing emergency of the present situation, then there is only one consistent line of action for us left, that is, the formation of a straight out-and-out Political Prohibition Party. Temperance men are reluctant to take such a step, but feeling is now so strong, the anxiety and determination of an enlightened public sentiment thoroughly roused is so much in earnest, that if Parliamentary men will not do something, the people will; and the people can, and if they are driven to the line of action indicated, they will undertake it with the energy and success that have already characterized their Scott Act campaign.

We have still hope that the present session of Parliament will not be allowed to close without some deviation from the do-nothing policy that is little less than an insult to the intelligence of the great temperance public; and that we may thereby be relieved from the necessity of doing what would be a painful duty, but one which we shall not, on that account, hesitate to perform.

SCOTT ACT "BOYCOTTING."

It is said that a number of our temperance friends are lukewarm on the question of the Scott Act because they are afraid of being "boycotted" if they were found among the warm supporters of the Act. This we find to be especially the case with many who are in business and rely upon the support and custom of others for their success. They fear that owing to the expensive ramifications of the liquor interests they will lose the trade of all who are termed "anti-Scott Act" people as well as all others who can be influenced by such persons. There is no doubt but that in Toronto—the hot bed of the liquor traffic—the most desperate efforts will be put forth to prevent the passage of the Scott Act, and that there are many who would consider "boycotting" quite a legitimate means to assist in gaining their ends. At the same time we believe that to relax any efforts in furtherance of the Scott Act movement because through fear of being "boycotted" would be both foolish and wrong.

There are many reasons why such a fear should not influence the action of any person but we will only mention a few.

In the first place it is cowardly. When we have made up our minds that as a matter of duty to ourselves, our friends and society, we ought to throw the weight of our influence in favor of the Scott Act, but fear that our doing so will have a prejudicial effect on our business, we say it is cowardly to allow such a dread to deter us from following the line of duty. Men have to make sacrifices very often for the sake of principle and we admire them for it even when those principles are what we believe to be wrong. We have, however, nothing but contempt for the man who has not the courage of his convictions. We cannot afford to be cowardly. Every man must be ready to face every danger which comes in the way of duty or he loses the claim to be called a man.

In the second place it is wrong for a man to yield to such a fear. When we have before us a movement such as the present in favor of the Scott Act there is no middle course. We must be either on the right or wrong side, and when a man sees his duty in regard to the temperance cause, which is now synonymous with the Scott Act agitation, he is guilty of a moral wrong if he permits any selfish motive to prevent his doing his duty. This applies especially to Christian people. If you wish to avoid scared consciences and unhappy reflections come out on the right side.

In the next place, it is a fear which brings upon a man, if he carries it into effect, the contempt of both parties. Does any one think that assuming a neutral position in this matter will win any respect from the persons who have coerced him into that attitude? Every sensible person must know that as soon as these parties have accomplished their purpose with such a man they will throw him away. There can be no true regard or respect for a man actuated by such a cowardly fear.

Again, no honorable or decent person would "boycott" a man for acting in accordance with his own ideas of right and wrong. Such a course of conduct will only be pursued by those who are determined to gain their ends by any means however questionable; and will a man who has any pretensions to standing in society or business circles allow himself to be coerced into doing what he knows to be wrong because some person or persons are so unprincipled as to make such an attempt.

Next, this fear is we believe, to a great extent, a delusion. No doubt "boycotting" will be indulged in to a limited extent, but the Anti-Scott Act people are by far too wise to think they can accomplish the defeat of the Scott Act by such action. There has been no general movement in that direction, and we are finally convinced that at the first indication of such a thing, the opponents of the Scott Act will strike a blow at their own cause from which they cannot recover. There is a spirit of justice and fairness abroad which would at once resent such a movement. Even in individual cases, if it is brought to light we feel certain that so far from being successful the person who is the object of it will receive such a hearty support from other quarters as will much more than compensate for any temporary inconvenience he may have sustained.

We are aware that there are some professedly temperance people who say they do not feel quite satisfied yet as to the propriety of carrying the Scott Act, or as to the practicability of working it if it were carried. To such we can only say that the fact of the movement being carried on by Christian and temperance people the Act having been carried by such sweeping majorities nearly all over Ontario, and the utter failure of all efforts for repeal wherever it has been tested, are sufficient guarantee of the benefits derivable from its operation. We want every friend of temperance to rally round the Scott Act standard and use his best efforts to drive the monster Intemperance from our fair Dominion.