

certificate of justice number two is equally worthless ; but the two worthless certificates joined into one become good and valid authority for the sale of any quantity of spirits ? Two worthless nothings under Scott Act ethics become a very important something, and the whole contains 'vastly more than all its parts. If the joint certificate of two justices' is sufficient to warrant the sale of a pint of spirits, why not simplify matters a little and make the certificate of one justice good for half a pint ? But then the whole gist and tenor of the Scott Act is directed against the danger of selling, not too much but too little ! It is not safe to sell a man less than a pint, but perfectly safe to sell him a barrel ! Scott Act logic limps badly. Again, if it is right to drink wine in church on Sunday, why is it wrong to drink it in the dining room or the hotel on Monday ? If it is right for a man to drink spirits with the sanction of a physician, why is it wrong to drink it with the sanction of a man's own judgment and conscience ? Why discriminate and allow clergymen, doctors, and justices to procure all the liquor they want, while all other classes are debarred the indulgence ? First banish wine and spirits from the churches and the druggists before undertaking to banish it from the the dining-rooms and hotels. First, pull the beam out of your own eye, and then you will see better how to pull the mote out of your brother's eye. In counties where the Scott Act is in force, distillers are allowed to manufacture and sell spirits in quantities not less than ten gallons, and brewers to make and sell beer in quantities not less than five gallons, to be forthwith removed out of the county, and out of any adjoining county in which the Scott Act is in force. If it is wrong to sell liquor for consumption in one county, on what principle of justice or equity can it be right to allow it to be sold for use in another county ? If it is wrong for the individual to buy liquor from the distiller or brewer in his own county (and the Scott Act declares it to be wrong), on what principle of justice can it be right for him to buy it from the distiller or brewer in another county, and bring it into his own for use ? Why drive the trade out of one county into another ? Why compel the inhabitants of one county to do all their trading in liquor in another county ? Why banish whiskey and beer from one county merely to deluge the inhabitants of another county with it ? On what principle of moral ethics can this phase of the Scott Act be justified.—Gentlemen, it won't do.

By a strange perversion of the very principle claimed to be at the bottom of prohibitory legislation, the 'minimum quantity allowed to be sold by a druggist under the Scott Act is limited to one pint, while the maximum is unlimited—the druggist cannot sell less than a pint to one person, but he can sell him a barrel ? How this system is calculated to promote temperance and sobriety baffles ordinary comprehensions. It won't do.

The Scott Act unjustly discriminates in favour of privileged classes. The doctor, the clergyman, and two justices and a mechanic (it always takes two justices and a mechanic to equal one doctor and