

cannot see that the mere fact of the Upper House being composed of the peers gives to the Lower House a status it could not otherwise enjoy. Should any one doubt the truth of that proposition, he may profitably occupy his leisure in the solution of the question—Is it or is it not the fact that in the United States, and in France, and in short in every other Democracy where there are two Chambers, seats in the Lower House are not coveted as in England, and are not sought for by the same class of men? But need we go abroad? Though our national basis is not Democratic, we are by no means ignorant as to, or wanting in, Democratic institutions. We have our civic Corporations with their head, the Mayor, and their two Chambers—Aldermen and Common Council. We have also our Vestries.

Let us assume that some existing institution or practice is alleged to be objectionable.—It is obvious that one of three courses is open:—The matter may be left alone; it may be modified; it may be abolished. The fact that the matter can be dealt with in one of three ways almost necessarily brings into existence four parties, viz.:—those who deny the allegation; those who admit it, but decline to interfere; those who suggest modification or substitution; and those who advocate simply abolition. As no two persons can see any material object from the same point of view, it may be reasonably assumed that no two persons can regard an alleged fact from exactly the same point of view. There may be those who do not believe the allegation, who do not credit the evidence or appreciate the arguments adduced in support of the alleged defect. There must be those who believe the existing institution to be good; the mere fact that it has long existed goes far to prove that it was at one time good, *i.e.*, in the

sense of having been suitable to the wants of the particular community. It is not unreasonable for such to argue—If it was at one time adapted to the wants of the community and consonant with its notions, it cannot have become unsuitable and inconsonant at a given moment. Another may say—Assuming it to be admitted that the institution had ceased to be as well adapted as formerly, that of itself is not sufficient reason for change; it may still be equally consonant with the notions of the general body. Another may say—Assuming it to be admitted that it is less adapted and less consonant than formerly, the double admission is not necessarily sufficient to justify change, for that to which we have become accustomed has to us advantages not lightly to be disregarded. Another may say—Though I am satisfied that the old has ceased to be suitable, is it clear that your suggested substitution warrants the change?—Is the suggested substitution suited, not merely to the moment, but to a future of such duration as to warrant the change; and with no small force might argue that change in the case of national institutions, creeds, or laws demands the most careful deliberation, and can never be justified by anything short of necessity.

As the result of the labour of ages, our forefathers have built, brick by brick, for and have bequeathed to us a system which provides ample checks to sudden political impulses and premature action, whether on the part of the Crown, the Lords, or the Commons. To explain them, reference must be made not merely to the struggle between the Crown and the Nobles, and between the Crown and the Commons, but to the origin and effect of party government.—*Educational Times.*

(To be continued.)