

of a military hospital, where brave men who had gone forth to carry her flag at the call of duty were stretched out in suffering and agony, awaiting their marching orders to the spirit

world. In her letters to the bereaved or the unfortunate, when sorrow or calamity overtook them, and in her own sad face, one could see that under the Royal purple which she wore there throbbed a heart full of the tenderest sympathy and compassion for suffering humanity.

As a Sovereign.

Turning to her career as Sovereign, we find that she was equally worthy of admiration. Her Court was pure. Whatever might be said about the other Royal Courts of Europe, and gossip has not always been silent respecting them, it is a delightful truth that no reflections were ever cast upon the Court of her Majesty Queen Victoria. To be accepted there was a passport to all the Courts of the world. Not only as Queen was she defender of the faith of her people by her oath of coronation, but she was also the resolute defender by her example of private and public morality. She was a constitutional Monarch. The Anglo-Saxon race undoubtedly possesses a genius for self-government, but it is equally true that the Anglo-Saxon race resents arbitrary rule. No Monarch that affected absolute power could long sit on the British throne. Charles I. tried it and failed; James II. made a similar attempt and was banished from the realm. George III. approached very nearly the utmost limit of his constitutional rights when he insisted on coercing the American colonists in the face of remonstrances from his Ministers, and he lost an empire. William IV. violated well-established precedents when he dismissed Lord Melbourne's Government at a time when it had the confidence of Parliament, chiefly because Lord Melbourne was a Whig. In the long reign of Queen Victoria, however, personal or political preferences never interfered with the well-known currents of constitutional government, and, whether it was Sir Robert Peel from whom she differed with respect to the management of her household, or Gladstone, whose measures for the disestablishment of the Irish Church she disliked, the Minister who was the choice of Parliament invariably received her fullest confidence. And, although Britain during her reign was more than once shaken by social upheavals, such as the Chartists' uprising in 1837 and the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, never was the invective of the agitator directed against the Queen. Hyde Park might be filled with its restless thousands, and a surging mob might gather in Trafalgar square to denounce Parliament and to demand a redress of alleged grievances; Ministers might be hissed at public meetings, and the Lords denounced for their protection to reform; but never was it said that she, without whose signature no act of Parliament was binding, ever stood in the way of any movement for the amelioration of her subjects. She enjoyed

more than any Sovereign that ever sat upon the British throne that immunity from popular censure which is implied in the well-known aphorism: "The King can do no wrong."

True to Britain.

She was first and always a British Sovereign. No matter how great the national emergency, she was never known in her intercourse with any foreign Court or in the most delicate negotiations with foreign diplomatists to suppress her dignity as Queen, or to attempt to circumvent her Ministers, or to surrender through fear or flattery any of the rights of her people. To be Queen of Great Britain fully satisfied her ambition, even should it involve the splendid isolation which so long characterized her island home. And as her own allegiance was undivided, so she devoted her life to promote the undivided allegiance of her people. As a pledge of her anxiety in this respect the heir apparent, now King, at her request visited Canada and India, and her son, Prince Alfred, Australia, and I have no doubt that her son-in-law, the Marquis of Lorne, was appointed Governor-General of Canada as a mark of respect for her Canadian subjects. Moreover, she herself, undaunted by the infirmities of four score years, gave to the people of Ireland, by her personal presence, the best proof she could have given them of her appreciation of their loyalty and their splendid contribution to the defensive forces of the nation. And if the colonists are to-day more attracted to the empire than they were sixty years ago, we may safely assume that the interest manifested by her Majesty in their welfare has largely contributed to that happy condition. And as a result of that interest how marvellous the change. In the first year of her reign many Canadians were prepared to sever the link which bound them to her throne and unite with the American Republic. At the close of her reign, in all her vast dominions none were more sincerely trusted than the Canadians for their loyalty and attachment to the empire over which she reigned. In the twenty-first year of her reign her subjects in India rose in rebellion against her authority; in the last year of her reign a few thousand British soldiers are able to preserve the peace of her Indian Empire, numbering 240,000,000 people. No more truly did the descending angel impart supernatural healing power to the waters of Siloam than did the silent dignity and authority of Queen Victoria subdue the baser passions of humanity and command their loyalty and respect.

A Lover of Peace.

She believed devoutly in preserving the peace of the empire. How often has the arrogance of some misguided ruler, even of some who sat upon the British throne, changed the world into a veritable "Aceldema." Bannockburn and Flodden in Scottish history, Naseby and Preston in English history, without mentioning the wave of blood which rolled over the fields of Mar-engo, Waterloo and Sedan, testify to the recklessness of ambition and the madness of misguided, arbitrary power.