

every man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, to excuse those who hold lands from paying the rent-charge, which was the condition upon which their lands had been granted?" (The Van Renselaer anti-rent movement was nothing to this.)

Did not the same body, at the end of the late war, fix an artificial famine upon the nation during 34 years (1815 to 1849) to keep up rents? Think of the deaths by hunger and the bankruptcies, and the first general in Europe employing his strategical talents to keep down the insurrection of the starving multitude.

Is he not aware that the House of Lords resisted the abolition of the slave-trade, that hideous traffic in human flesh, after resolutions in its favour had passed the Commons (1792), and thus got its introduction deferred for ten long years?

He must remember the opinions of the most enlightened jurists respecting the game laws. Did he find any poachers in the gaols of America? Did he hear of any midnight encounters there with maimings and murders? No; they have not perpetual civil war there about my lord's partridges.

Notorious instances of speculation in railway matters are stated of the Lords; but, granting it to be true that as a body they were less mixed up with railway matters than the Commons, yet there are reasons which may account for this. Railways were trading concerns, and as such, too vulgar for the chivalry to have anything to do with. Besides, they had the spoils of the nation at their feet, and it was hardly worth while to fly at such small game as railways. But if the author really