

factions to the dignity of parties, we should be inclined to allow others who may be supposed to know more about statecraft than ourselves to discuss the questions at issue between them, so long as they did not intrench upon the sphere of morals and religion. But if either or both of these factions lend their influence to the fostering of a power which is at war with both civil and religious liberty—a grasping, unscrupulous organisation, which is not only inimical to evangelical Christianity, but to every distinctive element of our modern Christian civilisation—they must not expect us to be silent. Now this is precisely what they are doing. “The Catholic vote” is the idol before which both “Conservative” and “Liberal” bow down, and at whose shrine they worship. No wonder that the Romish hierarchy is audacious and defiant if, as we have but too good reason to believe, even the very highest appointment in the power of the Crown, in this Protestant province of Ontario, is not made without respect to its will. The fact is that such is the attitude of parties, and their relative strength, and such the lust of power in both of them, that the Catholic League, the instrument of the priests, holds the balance of power and is master of the situation. It is high time for Christian men to look into this matter. If the existing state of things is one of the necessary incidents of party government, it is a serious question whether this thing, whatever advantages it may possess, does not really cost more than it is worth.

#### PROHIBITION.

The Convention which met in Montreal on the 15th September was an event of no small significance and importance. It is said to have been the most intelligent, influential, and business-like gathering of the kind ever convened in this country. Its promoters were chiefly members of Parliament interested in the passage of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, who were anxious to submit several important questions relating to this matter to the representatives of the several temperance organisations. The questions referred chiefly to the state of public opinion and the feasibility of executing the law if it were enacted; the character and provisions which the law must possess in order to render it acceptable to temperance men; and, finally, the acceptability or non-acceptability of a law passed subject to ratification or rejection by the vote of the people. These several questions were very fully discussed, and the sense of the Convention embodied in a series of resolutions strongly condemnatory of the license laws; affirming in the most unequivocal terms that nothing short of the total prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage would be satisfactory to the Convention; and, finally, urging the Dominion Parliament to enact a law having this for its object, subject to