

but in which there was associated with him a council or parliament, representing or supposed to represent the people at large, or such part of them as were thought worthy to have the suffrage, and having power, either alone, or in conjunction with the king, to determine the manner in which that executive authority shall be exercised. It is in this sense that the author of a well known school history, calls the period from 1485 to 1688, the period of "personal" monarchy, and that from 1688 to our own time, the period of "constitutional" monarchy.

Then, as nations rose to overthrow the old order, they began to demand not only that governments should be limited, but that the limitations should be written down; and thus came the last use of the term "constitution," for the document which determines the character of the various powers in a state, and the limits of their action. In this sense France and the United States have constitutions, and England has not; and in this sense Canada has a constitution so far as certain parts of her political life are concerned, and has not so far as others are concerned.

There are thus at least three senses of the term constitution: the way in which as a matter of fact a country is or has been governed; the way in which it is supposed a country should be governed; and an instrument setting forth a method of government: and in addition, *constitutional* has come to be used as descriptive of a particular form of limited monarchy. Which of these meanings should be had in view when we address ourselves, in this department of Political Science, to the study of *constitutional* history? That will depend upon the object we have in view. If our purpose is that of the constitutional lawyer, whose object is to anticipate or influence the decision of a court of justice on a constitutional question submitted to it, all we need study, in countries which have a written constitution, is, the text of this document, the legislative enactments by which it has