

captive had been liberated upon his express promise to pay he would be bound to make the payment? He would not be bound to do so either in the forum of law or in the forum of morals. For those who have attempted the subversion of society can have no rights arising from contracts which a good citizen is bound to respect. The king was wrong and was justly put to death, but that insincerity for which he has been condemned by history was not an abnormal development but the natural outcome of the principles which he professed.

The extent to which he had deluded himself appears from his language after his condemnation. "It will be a glorious death. I shall die for the law of the land and for maintaining the true Protestant Religion." And again "You must give God his due, the King his due, and the people their due,—that is their liberty but their liberty consists in having government, it is not in their having a share in the government,—that is nothing appertaining to them." What he meant by giving God his due, was to sustain Episcopal Church Government; and by giving the King his due he meant letting him do what he liked. Could anything be done with such a character but to remove him from a world in which he had gone hopelessly astray?

The argument of Mr. Cook for the prosecution falls back upon elementary principles. He does not detect the fallacy which lurks in "Honor the King." As Scripture was then understood it did not admit either of contradiction or qualification. But as he also believed in the infallibility of Scripture nothing remained but to ignore this maxim altogether. He contended that the monarchy was always limited—that the King is not above the law; and that as the laws had provided no means of trying him upon a charge of high treason that power must either reside in the representatives of the people or it does not exist at all.

Nowhere does that cant which made the name of Puritan hateful to the people as England appear in such a repulsive form as in that passage where Mr. Cook provides for the eternal welfare of the King. In reading it one is reminded of a judge who after passing sentence of death upon a prisoner convicted of forgery addressed him thus: "I exhort you to look to a higher power in another world for that mercy which a due regard for the paper currency of the country forbids you to expect in this." With pious unction the prosecuting counsel proceeds: "God will not forgive his temporal punishment. Yet if God in him will be pleased to add one example more to the Church of his unchangeable love to his elect in Christ (*not knowing but that he may belong to the election of grace*) I am troubled in my spirit in regard to his eternal condition for fear that he should depart this life without love and recognition for all those saints whom he hath scorned under the notion of Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents and Sectaries.

While the King was not a martyr, yet on the other hand he was not a murderer. He simply staked his life upon an obsolete principle and lost. The Puritans who conquered him in the name of liberty proved to be the most relentless oppressors of those in the New World who differed from

their views. Neither party is entitled to a verdict of unqualified approval at the bar of history. And yet the experience through which the nation passed is of permanent value. The great actors of history whether their greatness consists in their good or in their evil deeds stand like sentinels upon the watchtower and light their beacons on the heights. As a great writer has said: "This is the course which you should pursue as beyond all others salutary and profitable in the study of history to keep your gaze steadily fixed on its instructions derived from every variety of example and displayed on a conspicuous monument for your guidance. Thence you may take for yourself and the state in which you belong what you should imitate. There you may see what is base in its inception and base in its issue which you should shun."

What lesson shall we learn from these great events? We are in no danger from a king or from a House of Lords. The power which formerly resided in them now resides in the ballot-box. In theory by that institution the will of the majority is clearly made manifest and the majority may be trusted to do nothing hostile to their own interests. The candidates for parliamentary honours would of course do nothing to interfere with the free expression of popular opinion. Their very name proves as much,—"*candidus*" pure white, from the custom of clothing the aspirant for honors in the Roman Republic with a robe of white emblematic of the mystic purity of the soul within. And here it may not be out of place to point out the derivation of that ambition which prompts these clean spirits to scorn delights and live laborious days. It is derived from the Latin "*ambitus*,"—"going about," shaking hands with the electors and being very solicitous about their welfare.

But while these excellent men would do n thing wrong, yet the proceedings of the election courts show that a class of men exists which is quite ready and willing to do wrong on their behalf. There lies the danger to government in the New World. It is generally believed that General Hayes did not represent the majority of votes cast according to law, and yet he became the highest officer of State. In the Dominion of Canada the laws against bribery are explicit and severe. If any improvement in them is required it need only be to make the giving of bribes as criminal as the taking of them. The best safeguard, however, will be found in an awakening of public opinion against the slightest irregularity. If we allow them to pass we may finally arrive at that stage of decadence which Livy so graphically describes in the Roman Republic, "when we can bear neither our vices nor their remedies." The great lesson which we should learn from History is that which we all admit in theory but too often neglect in practice, that eternal vigilance is the price of safety.

THOMAS MILLIDGE.