

they had no control; that the start shall be fair in life both for the said baby, and for his fellow human unit whose sire rests beneath the sod of the village churchyard; that such public honours shall be dispensed impartially to each as his services may merit, and no degradation be bestowed except for misconduct and crime. Is the doctrine sound now? At least, if acted on, it would tend to spare the young the sight of idleness and frivolity in high places, a sight much more likely to be instructive in its way than any abstract exhortations in another.

It is astonishing that so acute a person as the author should have mistaken so plain a phrase. But he has made no such error in favour of the republic; like the mistake in mine host's bill, it is on his own side of the question.*

The author appears to think that property and enlightenment usually go together; but are not the observations of the ancients rather true on the enervating effects of luxury—that the effect of large hereditary possessions, especially when accompanied with hereditary honours, is to indispose the mind to active exertion? An historian has remarked, that under such circumstances men return to the instincts of savage life, such as the chase, and slaughter of wild animals, and the management of fiery horses.

Let any one compare the speeches of the hereditary members of the House of Lords on the subjects of the day, with the essays in the "Times" newspaper and

* The declaration of the French National Assembly is, "Men are born free, and equal in respect of their rights," the meaning of which is tolerably plain to any one not determined to pervert it.