

masters." In a free state no man is master of any other, nor is there any need that he should be. What Mr. Lowe was really afraid of was that the mastery previously possessed by a limited class should pass out of their hands.

In the present day we are accustomed to make a broad distinction between legislation and government; but, in point of fact, legislation is one of the two great divisions of government, the other being administration. Parliament makes laws; the duty of the executive is to administer those laws faithfully and honestly, without respect to persons and with a sole view to the public good.

As regards legislation an important point to notice is the altered position of the legislator as compared with that which he occupied under a more limited suffrage. If we go back a little over one hundred years, we find Edmund Burke addressing the electors of Bristol as follows: "If we do not allow our members to act upon a very enlarged view of things, we shall at length infallibly degrade our national representation into a *confused and scuffling bustle of local agency*." Burke wanted a strong and enlightened Parliament to stand up against an encroaching court; and he did not think Parliament could be strong if its members were reduced to the rank of mere delegates—echoes, not voices. It is impossible not to be struck with his foresight when he speaks of the danger that Parliament may degenerate into "a confused and scuffling bustle of local agency." I think the words describe something with which we are not wholly unacquainted in this country, and which exists in great perfection across our border. I must, however, quote a few words more to show the distance we have travelled since Burke's time. Referring to the course he had held in regard to the troubles in Ireland, he says: "I conformed to the instructions of truth and nature, and maintained your interest against your opinions with a constancy that became me. A representative worthy of you ought to be a person of stability. I am to look indeed to your opinions, but to such opinions as you and I must have five years hence. I was not to look to the flash of the day. I knew that you chose me with others to be a pillar of the state, and not a weathercock, on the top of the edifice, exalted for my levity and versatility." In a former speech he had said: "Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion. . . . Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests. . . . It is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole, where not local purposes and local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good. . . . You choose a member indeed, but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but a member of Parliament."

A generation or more later, when the Reform Bill of 1832 was being introduced, Sir Robert Inglis, the member for Oxford, took a very similar stand. "This House," he said, "is not a collection of deputies as the States General of Holland, and as the assemblies in some other