

ment may be developed from Monarchy; it cannot be developed from Democracy.

It is said that, that system is the best which secures the greatest good to the greatest number. Possibly; but what is intended by the assertion? I do not pretend to say, nor should I have alluded to it were it not to direct attention to the fact that there are many captivating phrases and terms which sound well enough, but which, when considered, tested, or applied, prove worthless and delusive. Nothing, for example, sounds better than the phrase, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." It is not difficult to imagine the effect of that cry on a down-trodden and oppressed people, to whom liberty and fraternity are as strange as equality. We know what the cry accomplished in France in 1792; but when we reflect on the horrors of that bloody revolution, when human beings were slaughtered like vermin, we realize to the full the meaning of Hobbes, when he said, "Whosoever thinking sovereign power too great will seek to make it less, must subject himself to a power which can limit it, that is to say, to a greater." "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" may sound more pleasing than "Liberty, Inequality, and Fraternity," but the difference is simple—the one is possible, the other is not. The one "Liberty, Inequality, and Fraternity," faithfully represents institutions both divine and human; the other, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," expresses a state of things that never did and never can exist in fact. Communism, except in theory, is an impossibility.

Monarchy on the one hand, and Democracy on the other, appear to me alike incapable of fully satisfying the wants of a political community that has attained its majority. The father, his elder and his younger sons are the natural prototypes of Kings,

Lords, and Commons. If the union of King, Lords, and Commons is true to nature, whereas other systems are not, then that union must possess advantages which other systems do not. Does it? I contend that it does. In all the stages of our history, the tendency and effect of the union has been to level up, and that was never more so than at present. There is not a British child, however humble, of whom it can confidently and with reason be said—He will not die a peer.

To hear some talk, one might conclude that peers were unlike other mortals; that, once in the House of Lords, a man and his posterity lived for ever.

Those who entertain such notions would do well to reflect on the fact that more than two-thirds of the present peerage are creations of this century—a fact which, reduced to figures, simply shows that upwards of 300 commoners have been created peers within the present century; and why? Not, we may be sure, by reason of their having been drones in the British hive. The peerage, as we all know, is the highest reward in the gift of the Crown for services rendered by the British subject to his country; and we do well to reflect on the fact that it is a reward that is not and cannot be in the gift of the president of any Democracy, that it is a reward that has and does secure to the country the active services of her best men, to whom money would be no incentive to labour. The Crown being the national fountain of honour, the peerage the recipients of its highest favours, and the Commons the source whence—with the sole exception of Royalty—the peerage must be derived, if one may so express it, a steady flow of honourable aspiration is kept up throughout the life-blood of the entire community.

One must be blind indeed who