on the appeal in O'Connell's case to the House of Lords, the two Conservative law lords voted one way and the three Whigs the other, while the judges whose opinion had been taken were on the side of the minority? At all events, let us have the case on which the opinion was given, and without which, as everybody knows, the opinion is worthless. But why opinions or cases at all? Why is anything left to suspicion or surmise? Why was not the country allowed to have the Constitutional question openly and fairly argued before its own Supreme Court? Why was every manœuvre and subterfuge employed to close the gate of public justice against the nation?

-Since the last appearance of the The Bystander, the verdict of experience has been pronounced upon the Scott Act, and assuredly no verdict ever was more decisive. It has told in England where the question had just come to a head, and in the United States, as well as here. In England it may even prove to have given Prohibition a death-blow. It is remarkable that the battle was fought and the decision of the people upon the issue was obtained by effort entirely outside the party lines. The politicians, as soon as the Temperance vote showed strength, fell on their knees before it, and political journals paid a homage which, as has since appeared, was hollow, to what they took to be the prevailing power. The first stand was made by the Liberal Temperance Union, a nonpolitical organization. The position taken by leading clergymen and preachers also produced its effect. By the members of the Liquor Trade, as they were morally disqualified by their interest in their own cause, no effectual resistance could be offered, and the Scott Act was taking in county after county, like the tide running in over a flat, when the Liberal Temperance Union appeared in the field. A word from men who were known to have none but a public interest in the matter set the people thinking for themselves and experience soon did the rest. Everywhere it was found that the effects of the