

Committee the result may not be satisfactory. It is not every Chancellor or ex-Chancellor who is competent to discuss the refinements of peerage law, the regular succession to dignities in the time of RICHARD II., and the precise words necessary to constitute the forfeiture of a peerage. The result of some modern peerage cases would almost point to the conclusion that the ends of truth would be best gained by leaving such questions to be decided by a committee of historians."

The law ought to be tender in preserving so ancient a dignity as the Earldom of Wiltes, compared with which most peerages are of mushroom growth. We Englishmen are the richer for every link that keeps unbroken the chain uniting the England of our own days with the England of the Plantagenets. A disregard for antiquity is neither good taste nor good policy. "He who careth not whence he came, careth little whither he goeth."

It may be questioned whether even so ancient an Earldom, the grant of a Plantagenet, would have added to the dignity of the late Simon Thomas Scrope of Danby, or to the loving esteem in which he was held, but all who love England must deplore the gradual extinction of our ancient historic families and dignities, and Yorkshiremen especially must feel aggrieved that the Earldom of Wiltes, illegally forfeited in 1399, should be allowed by the Crown to remain dormant when it might have been so becomingly and justly restored to so noble a descendant of an illustrious Yorkshire house—a man universally beloved and honoured, "*sans peur et sans reproche*," like Bayard, the "good Chevalier."

Let us hope that his son and successor, the present claimant, is not utterly discouraged by the judgment given so incomprehensibly against his grandfather in 1869—a judgment which really seems to have been what Lord Chief Baron Kelly said of a certain ecclesiastical judgment, that it was one "of policy, not of law." Is it possible that the *odium theologicum* can have entered here also, the Scropes of Danby