

unacquainted with the subject, and reading the remarks of writers who are opposed to fresh legislation, would certainly conclude (as large numbers of people have done) that some vital change was contemplated in our statutes, some deadly attack upon the so-called liberty of the subject which must be stedfastly repelled. The review already quoted says that the proposals contained in Mr. Dalrymple's Bill are so absurd that they do not demand serious attention : the writer concludes a powerful philippic against the Bill by asserting that if Parliament were to pass such a Bill the Court of Queen's Bench (now High Court of Judicature) would set it aside. "Happily," says the writer, "the judges of that court have both the power and the will to keep a check upon foolish legislation." I commend this conclusion to the attention of members of Parliament—it tells us pretty plainly that Parliament is not paramount after all, although the writer has missed the spot where power really lies. What if the threat which the prophet used against the people of Israel be realized in our own land, "that the prophets should prophesy falsely"—what if the "people should believe a lie?" their judgment be warped by the effects of neglected duty, and a Parliament be elected which should be imbued with the defective judgment which naturally belongs to the children of the inebriate. I may quote here an extract from the report of the Committee on Intemperance for the Lower House of Convocation, which Committee was presided over by my late esteemed friend Archdeacon Sandford, a report which is full of the most appalling evidence of the results of drink:—

"The evils inflicted on society and the nation at large by intemperance are not only harrowing and humiliating to contemplate, but are also so many and widespread as almost to defy computation. It may be truly said of our body politic 'that the whole head is sick