

Lords are antagonistic to the real desire of the people, can create any number of peers that it may think fit, and can therefore, if satisfied that it is its duty to do so, create Conservative or Liberal peers sufficient to silence any factious opposition on the part of the peers. It need hardly be stated that the Crown will not resort to this measure unless satisfied that it is demanded by the nation, of which fact it cannot be assured otherwise than by the constitutional method of ascertaining the will of the people—a dissolution of Parliament and a general election.

Glancing over the *Chronometrical Chart of English History*, and regarding it century by century, the following incidents appear to be landmarks in the growth of Constitutional Government—as we now understand it—in England. In 1066 William of Normandy laid claim to the crown of England, *jure successionis*. He repudiated the title *jure belli*. By chapters fifty-two and fifty-eight of his laws, however, he made feudalism, and that a most special feudalism, the rule of land tenure in England. He claimed, as vested in himself, the sovereign title to the soil of the country. All tenants were made mere usufructuaries—a theory, it need scarcely be said, consistent only with that of absolute monarchy. It is true that in theory no new laws could be enacted without the sanction of the Great Council of which the King was the head; but, as there was no security for individuals against acts of the prerogative, the King's will in matters temporal was practically absolute. Normans and Saxons alike were Roman Catholics. Politically and socially, the influence of the Church was enormous. The Church of Rome was, in fact, at that period, the dominant power in Europe. In 1185 the ecclesiastical and the civil jurisdictions were separated.

*The Twelfth Century.*—Henry I. married a Saxon Princess, and gave to the Saxons a charter of liberties. Of him, Lord Brougham says:—"It is certain that, with great talents and address, Henry was one of the most unprincipled and tyrannical Princes that ever sat upon the English throne." Of the reign of Stephen, Mackintosh says:—"This reign presents the most perfect condensation of all the ills of feudality to be found in history." But there are a few bright spots even on the dark page of this century. Three Crusades, if of no other value, brought distant nations into contact. In 1107 the bishops were reluctantly forced to concede homage to the King. In 1164, we have in the Constitutions of Clarendon abundant proof that there was then living in this island those who clearly understood the true province of the Church and that of the secular power, and to whom the notion of *imperium in imperio* and papal interference was intolerable. A careful study of the Constitutions of Clarendon will amply repay the student; he will there find why the archbishops and other spiritual dignitaries were made barons of the realm. Attempts were also made to place secular law on a firmer basis. Trial by battle was superseded by sixteen sworn recognitors. The country was divided into six districts, and itinerant justices were appointed to secure the administration of uniform justice. The twelfth century closed with a population in England of about two million, practically the same as that found by William in 1066. Natural increase and the influx of Normans had been balanced by the horrors of civil war.

*The Thirteenth Century.*—The annals of the dawn of this century are stained with royal blood-shed, if not by the hands, at the instance of Royalty. It is said that King John caused the assassination of his nephew