

plain. One would have thought that the result of Combes endeavors would not have allured the English government to follow in his footsteps. We find men who are perhaps the foremost statesmen in France, denouncing, at this present moment, the violent injustice of Combes that has to-day brought France to the very brink of revolution. This is what the Lords seek to avert in England. This is what their opponents say they are not justified in interfering with. It is left for the impartial reader to draw his own conclusions.

One of the principle arguments of opponents of the Lords—in fact their principle argument is that the Lords are not justified in opposing the will of the people as expressed by the House of Commons. Now if the action of the Lords is unjustifiable because it prevents the will of the people, as expressed by their elected representatives, from having effect, then that body is to be condemned for doing that which, by virtue of its very constitution, it has a right to do.—The English people have created the House of Lords not merely to give its assent to everything approved of by the House of Commons, but to accept or reject bills sent to it by the latter body, according as it deems these bills just or unjust, in the interest of the common good or opposed to it. If we admit that opposition to the House of Commons by the House of Lords constitutes an injustice, then must we also admit that the House of Lords can justly do nothing else than assent to all measures presented to it by the House of Commons. If it must give its assent, why does it exist? If it cannot oppose the House of Commons, then the English people have created it to no purpose whatever. Will opponents of the Lords defend this position?

Again their claim that all legislation must be the expression of the popular will, and that members must obey the mandates of those whom they represent, is a doctrine that one of the greatest of British statesmen, Edmund Burke, has characterized as arising from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of the British Constitution. "A legislator", he says, "owes to the people, not only his industry but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving them if he sacrifices his judgment to their opinion". The statesmen of the past have been one with Burke on this question, nor is there to be found to-day a statesman of prominence, who would venture to uphold the doctrine that the will of the people, no matter how unmistakably expressed, is to be the guide of those entrusted with the making of laws. It is justice and expediency