

sive act; nor suit which will force the collector to give a receipt except so far as a rather inadequate law of Virginia passed January 14, 1882, allows him to do so; for it appears that this act, as being an equivalent for a State law in existence when the coupons were issued, is considered part of the contract and in substance irrevocable.

Four justices, including the Chief Justice, dissent. They base their dissent upon the broad ground that the Eleventh Amendment, because it is an amendment, or is subsequent to the original Constitution, sweeps away all opposing clauses and renders an individual powerless to hold a State to its contract. Undoubtedly their reasoning is less subtle than the reasoning of the majority of the court. It is the cutting of a hard knot, because its windings and twistings, though possible to unravel, tire the patience. The reasoning would commend itself to the unlearned in law as much as they would deprecate its results, and the more unlearned the more it commends itself to them.

The importance of these new decisions can hardly be overrated. If they are accepted without resistance, they will mark the first victory of the Supreme Court over a really recalcitrant and angry State. The supremacy of the national power as represented by the Executive was of course triumphant in the civil war, and was before triumphant in lesser struggles, as in the Whiskey Rebellion and in Jackson's famous victory, through threats of force, over South Carolina; but until the present time the United States has never been victorious in its judiciary department over a State determined to defy it. Chisholm, it is true, in 1792 obtained a decree that judgment by default should go against Georgia if she did not appear before a certain day; but before that day the indignant and frightened State succeeded in pushing through Congress the Eleventh Amendment, under which Virginia has just sought shelter through devious and intricate legal paths. There have been many other cases before the Supreme Court in which acts of State Legislatures have been declared unconstitutional and void, but never when the State has used all its civil power, its intellect and obstinacy, backed finally by a united public opinion, to frustrate the constitutional demands of hated creditors. These decisions are, then, the first absolutely peaceable triumph of the Constitution and its honest principles over the narrowness, bitterness, and often dishonesty of local popular will, and as such they form an epoch in constitutional history. It is a triumph of the regular power of the national Government over the irregular power of the State, just as the Arlington case was a triumph over irregular power of the national Government.

CONNECTICUT'S WARNING AGAINST THE FEDERAL EDUCATION SCHEME.

THE question of Federal aid to education in the States, with an especial view to overcoming illiteracy at the South, is so important that it merits thorough discussion. The letters that we have received, and continue to receive, since our recent article, and the comments of other journals upon the views then expressed, justify a recurrence to the sub-

ject. The great difficulty hitherto has been that the public has not given much thought to the vital issues involved, most people hastily yielding acquiescence to the scheme upon hearing the plausible surface arguments in its favor. Signs of a disposition to get at the fundamental principles underlying it are therefore welcome.

As we previously remarked, the North feels generously toward the South, and is therefore favorably disposed toward any measure that promises to dispel the cloud of ignorance which has overspread that part of the country. Moreover, many Northern people feel as though the nation was under an obligation to assume a portion of this burden. *The Christian Union* speaks for this class when it says:

"An appropriation for education in the Southern States is not a gift of charity; it is the payment of a debt due by justice. The nation shares in the responsibility for slavery. It is wholly responsible for emancipation and enfranchisement. If the South had enfranchised the blacks, we might leave the South to educate them; but in putting the ballot into one hand we obliged ourselves to put the school-book into the other."

It is also urged that the Federal Government virtually rendered educational assistance to the new States in the West by setting apart school lands for them, and that the Southern States, with the ignorance thrust upon them by emancipation, now stand in far more urgent need of assistance from the nation.

All the pleas for Federal aid proceed upon the assumption that such aid will be a good thing for the South. It is this assumption which we combat. We maintain that the worst thing which could befall the cause of education in the South would be a series of liberal appropriations from the national Treasury for a series of years. We mean, of course, the worst thing in the long run, for no judgment upon such a matter is of any value which is not based upon a long look ahead. We are ready to admit that more Southern voters might be able to read ten years hence if \$100,000,000 should be appropriated by Congress for use chiefly in Southern schools than if the States were left to their own resources; but we insist that this temporary gain in intelligence would be purchased at the cost of a permanent loss in character vastly more important—the loss of self-reliance and self-respect.

One fact counts for more than a volume of theorizing, and it is therefore most fortunate that the demoralizing influence of outside school funds can be conclusively demonstrated from the experience of one of the oldest States in the Union. When Connecticut sold her Western Reserve lands, the proceeds were devoted to a school fund, in the expectation that this assistance would serve materially to elevate the standard of public education. The fund proved very productive, the income during the early part of this century varying from \$70,000 to \$100,000 a year, which was a large sum of money for a small State in those days, when the cost of maintaining schools was so much less than now. Before they had this outside income the people of Connecticut supported their schools entirely by taxation, just as the people of the South are doing now. What was the effect of receiving this assistance? The answer shall be furnished by Mr. C. D. Hine, Secretary of the State Board of Education, a recognized authority in the matters of which he speaks:

"The school fund derived from the sale of Western lands yielded an income last year of \$120,855, which amounts to 80 cents for each person of the school age. The average expense of educating each of these persons throughout the State is \$10 31, so that the fund now furnishes about 8 per cent. of the total cost. In those towns and cities where the people insist upon good schools no reliance is placed upon these permanent funds. Indeed, the history of our State shows conclusively that at the time when the fund was most productive, yielding \$1 40 or \$1 50 for each person of the school age, and when towns depended upon it, as they generally did, for the support of their schools, the schools themselves were poor and short. In fact, this was the darkest period of our educational experience. A very striking deterioration took place as soon as the fund became productive and the income began to be distributed. Before that period schools had been maintained at least six months, and at most nearly the whole year, according to the size of the district. After, and not long after, this new source of income was opened, the usual length of schools was reduced to only three months, or just the time that this fund would maintain the schools. The sums which came as gratuities relieved the people of responsibility and deadened their interest, until the schools were continued only so long as the charity lasted. Happily, the danger from this direction is passed and cannot return. The fund has probably reached its greatest productiveness, and the per capita will constantly decrease. The public schools must draw their sustenance from the people who are directly or indirectly benefited by them."

The Blair Bill simply proposes to do for the whole South what the Western Reserve fund did for Connecticut. Human nature is much the same everywhere, and if one were to try differentiating it, he certainly would not find the Southern character less likely to be demoralized by subsidies than the Northern. The men who had this fund set apart for the benefit of Connecticut's schools undoubtedly thought that they were doing the State a great service; but it has proved a curse, and the people are now congratulated that "the danger from this direction is passed," because the growth of population has forced them to tax themselves in order to educate their children. *The Christian Union* and the people who share its opinion that Federal appropriations for Southern education would be simply "the payment of a debt due by justice," are honest in their desire to benefit the South; but if they could accomplish their design, they would have proved its worst enemies.

The truth is that the South can educate herself, and is already beginning to do so. It will be a hard job, but her people, black and white, will be more manly, more self-reliant—more intelligent, in the long run—if they are left to work out their own salvation. The most hopeful sign for the South's future is that clear-headed Southern men are protesting against the efforts of well-meaning but shortsighted Northerners to give the South school money out of the Federal Treasury, which these Southern men see that she ought to raise and can raise herself.

GEORGE BORROW IN SPAIN.

SINCE reading the interesting papers on Borrow to which his death, in 1881, gave rise, I have been no little surprised to observe the resumption of the subject in the January number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, and a short Life in the fifth volume of the new 'Dictionary of National Biography.* I interpret this as an instinctive clinging on the part of the public to the manly and independent author who has left such deep

* For the Review articles, see *Littell's Living Age*, Nos. 1945-47-54 for 1881, and No. 2171 for 1886.

impressions on his time, and who will, I venture to prophesy, long continue to stir the hearts of his readers as for thirty years he has stirred my own.

This conviction prompts me to record some of my observations during a long residence in the Peninsula, in which the traces of the campaigns of 1835-40 often drew my attention to the man and his work. The period of Borrow's activity in Spain was during the reign of the Queen Regent, Doña Christina, and not of Isabella II., as some of the articles have stated, for Isabella was not declared to be Queen till 1844, at the age of thirteen. Borrow was in St. Petersburg in the summer of 1835, and the preface to his 'Targum,' published there in that year, is dated June 1. He left about the 10th of October, and reached Lisbon November 11, commissioned by the British and Foreign Bible Society to make an entrance for the Scriptures into Spain. The political situation was one of high excitation. The Liberals had demanded a constitutional government, but obtained only the sedative called the Royal Statute of 1834, which, instead of allaying, only aroused the popular passions till the revolution of "The Grange" (La Granja), in August, 1836, put the Progresistas in power. The Moderados, to whom the Queen Mother intrusted the fortunes of her child, being defeated, a tilt was kept up between the two great parties, which lasted till the temporary triumph of the advanced party culminated in the expulsion of Christina from Spain in 1840, after Borrow's work was done.

His appearance, then, on the scene in 1835 was at a most critical and difficult juncture. The partisans of Carlism filled the land with all the horrors of civil war, and the attention of the Madrid-Government was distracted from its legitimate cares by the sudden raids of Gomez, Cabrera, and other Carlist chieftains, threatening at times the very capital. Only those who know Old Spain can comprehend why Borrow, under these circumstances, began his mission *ex infimo*, with the lower orders. What would one of your sleek, solemn, black-gloved weaklings have wrought among the traditional *majos*, *manólos*, and *chulos*—"b'hoys" of the ring—the first to conciliate because they were and are the skirmishers of a foe that lurks in high places? What would kind words and Christian smiles have achieved among such men as you find crowded between the Lavapiés and the Calle de Toledo? We met them first in 1867, tamed by thirty years of modern civilization, with its whizz and whirr of steam and electricity. What must they have been in '37, with their red sashes bristling with knives, their cloaks concealing an arsenal of sinister tools, over the mufflers of which peeped coal-black eyes, and in whose breast pity never lodged!

Borrow's mission lay through the midst of these. The old words and the ancient strategy that had put him at the head of gypsedom in England were appealed to for personal insulation in the maze of hidden dangers in the Peninsula. With such "pals" he could defy the Captains-General, the night-prowling *alguaciles*, and even the lowest factotums of unscrupulous power. He set himself at work and became the *Inglesito*, "Master of the Seven Jargons," the friend of Montés, Sevilla, Poquito Pan, and all the guild of bull-baiting heroes once famous in the plazas of Madrid and Seyville.

After long searching I at last found a copy of the Gypsy Gospel—"El Embéo e Majaró Lúcas"—which Borrow translated in 1836 at Badajóz, "opré a mixa de Laloró" (on the frontier of Portugal), and printed at Madrid in 1837: a remarkable work, and one which, with the 'Gypsies of Spain,' whose vocabulary and facts were soon reproduced in Spanish, has had no small influence

on the popular language and even on the literature. The native vocabularies of Trujillo, Campuzano, Mayo, and others, which appeared since 1844, are simply Borrow's 'Gypsy Word-Book of 1841, concealed by false *caló* additions taken from the *Slang Dictionary* of Hidalgo. The celebrated dramatic author, Bretón de los Herreros, has several prose plays interlarded with Borrow's Gypsy words, a fact that is especially patent in the school editions by Germans, who know not what explanation to give them. See Booch-Arkossy's edition of "La Independencia" for ludicrous examples. The vulgar speech of the lowly at Madrid to-day cannot be understood without a knowledge of Mayo's (that is, Borrow's) vocabulary. At every turn you hear *gachó* for "cove"; *chavó* for "chummy"; *chachipé*, "that's so"; *parné*, money; *diquelár*, to see; *camelár*, to love, like, to flatter; *penár*, to say, to speak, etc., etc. Once it was the fashion in Spain to learn the Germania or cant language; Cervantes wrote a novel in it, and Quevedo several poems. Now Gypsy has replaced it, and an *Englshman* introduced the fancy! Borrow probably never knew it, but I can prove the statement by a volume of extracts, none of which will antedate 1842.

Borrow in his 'Bible' and 'Gypsies' has suffered at the public bar all those insinuations which a writer must undergo who thoroughly knows the country he describes. Most men who have attacked the subject have been prudent enough to limit their observations to what their eyes could fathom, carefully abstaining from a knowledge of the language whereby they might get at enough truth to jostle the prejudices of their readers, who want only to hear what they have been wont to believe. No scrupulous author likes to be included in a charge of exaggeration, and that apprehension often tones down his expressions till they reach untruth by the opposite extreme. The fact is, Borrow had an intimate knowledge of the Spanish character and language, and he gives us the most exact delineation of the plain Castilian to be found in literature. One of the best tests of such works is to translate portions of them to the natives of the district described. I have frequently done this before a group of the class he immortalizes, and never failed to elicit the most unequivocal marks of approval. One said, gravely: *El gachó e' mu' ducho* (the "cove" is an expert); another recognized the book to be profoundly Spanish—*muy español*—a decision which provoked unanimous assent, and from which there was no appeal. A third would condense his convictions into a most expressive exclamation, not intended for publication, but in the mind of all an apposite compliment.

The 'Bible' and 'Gypsies' are two extraordinary publications, worthy the adjectives "valuable and extremely interesting" which Mr. Longfellow applies to them. I do not remember to have discovered a positive error in them, and I have travelled with them all over the land, as in the sixteenth century Diego de Mendoza did with his 'Celestina' and 'Amadís de Gáula.' As to his exactness I will cite one example. In the London *Times* of 1836 are the political letters from Spain, perhaps by that correspondent to whom Borrow refers, on the Revolution of La Granja. The latter's statement of the affair seems exaggerated, but it is strictly true. The correspondent denies that General Quesada was mutilated that day by the infuriated mob. Borrow says he was, and that the Madrid roughs drank coffee from a monster bowl into which had been thrown the hands and fingers of the late Captain-General of the Province. Years after, the Spanish historian, Xavier de Búrgos, in his 'Annals of the Reign of Isabella the Second,' confirms Borrow in these words: "The masses

assassinated and mutilated him (Quesada), and returned to the capital bringing in triumph the bloody members of their victim, which were received in the Café Nuevo with the howlings of savage exultation proper to cannibals in their execrable orgies" (vol. iii, p. 307). Búrgos was one of the cabinet ministers in those days, and was in Madrid at the time of the Revolution. In many other respects Borrow's account is better and more exact than the ones now held as historical; for I have often heard the details from those who were with Queen Christina at the Grange that memorable day, when she was compelled to yield to the Sergeant García and sign the promulgation of the Constitution of Cadiz (1812).

Everywhere that I met Gitanos, they all knew "the Englishman," and the words he left in his vocabulary were everywhere current coin. I visited them in the Triana and the Macaróna, famous suburbs of Seville, and in the Albaicín of Granada on the slope where their *cuevas*, dug out of the solid earth, form the queerest of homes under the towers of the Alhambra. In Granada itself I once received a visit from the *conde*, or Gypsy chief, a tall, perfectly-formed man of middle age, who gave me his address written on a card in a fair, round hand: Señor António, Maéstro Herrero en el Salón—Mr. Anthony, Master Blacksmith on the Promenade (of the Genil)—a pure Jasper Petulengro of Spain.

Besides these Egyptian gentry, I met Borrow's blind girl of Manzanáres. His "girl" of nineteen was now a woman of fifty-five, I should judge; though age-telling is one of the mysteries of that country. I was returning from Portugal in 1876, and while the train stopped at this station which meets the through-line from Madrid to Cadiz, I heard a strong, but cheerful, pleasant voice cry out in the night: "Bon soir, messieurs, quelque chose pour la pauvre aveugle de Manzanáres." I saw the point at once and rushed out of the train to see her. She was decently dressed in the ordinary *percalina* of the country; her hair was now gray, but her form proud and erect, proper to the grave bearing of the peasant class to which she by birth belonged. She spoke to me in Spanish, Latin, and French, the latter more than passable. She remembered the *Inglés rubio* (the blonde Englishman), she said, and recognized that to him she owed much of her celebrity, and not a few of the *pesetas* she received. No one stopped at the station without remembering the *pobre ciega*—the poor blind woman, who speaks the tongue of the stranger.

As for his New Testament of 1837, Borrow has been stoutly attacked by an English writer whose twaddle was copied and endorsed on this side of the water, for forcing on the Spaniards the *Lutheran Bible* "when they had one as good of their own." I wonder if the grumbler ever saw the Spanish Lutheran Bible or the native one either. Now the best of the joke is that Borrow printed and circulated in the Peninsula just that *Catholic* version those haters of Bibles said he ought to have introduced. Spain had no Bible, Catholic or Protestant, till 1791-3, and then it came out in ten *folio* volumes, costing even now \$50 a set. Borrow simply reduced the New Testament of that Scio-Bible to one small volume, by leaving out the notes, commentary, and pictures; and Andrés Borrégo, the brave Liberal, still living at Madrid, printed it in the office of his journal, *El Español*.

What influence did Borrow's distribution of the New Testament exert on Spain from 1837? The influence that the wind has at harvest on a Spanish threshing-floor. The farmer drives his mules over the grain, then casts up the straw into the air, while the breeze carries away the chaff, leaving the pure wheat on the floor. Many a thoughtful man read the Englishman's book, gave

up the chaff of life, and fed for ever after on the golden grain. Who knows how many? We have met them in Galicia, at San Sebastian, at Madrid, at Valencia, at Seville, at Málaga. The well-known scholars, Luis de Usó y Rio, Fermin Caballero, Brunet of Guipúzcoa, Andrés Borrégo; the printers, José Martín Alegría, José Cruzado (through Usó), and many others, all dead save three, are the fruit of George Borrow's Bible in Spain. Of those whose names we cannot mention, two have surviving families, living on Government pensions, and to cite them by name would be, if not to deprive them of their sole support, at least to subject them to certain social ostracism. I met the venerable heads of these lovely families in 1872, and they told me that for thirty-five years they had held service at home, ignorant of collect, prayer, or form of worship. I possess the printed service they contrived to draw up, containing the prayers they daily read and extracts from the sacred book. When liberty of worship came in 1869 they took no overt part, well knowing that freedom in Spain was but nominal, or for the irresponsible poor. Usó y Rio, the noble Castilian and Castilian nobleman, lived a retired life from 1842 to his death in 1865, secretly editing the twenty volumes of the ancient Spanish Reformers, printed in the cellar of Alegría's house in the suburbs of Madrid, during the dark days of Isabella's reign. Fermin Caballero, once a minister of the crown, devoted himself to books and learning, and was the author of the 'Conquenses Ilustres,' or Illustrious Men of Cuenca, in four volumes, a set of which he gave me with his trembling autograph a month before he died. I followed his body to the grave one summer's day in 1876.

Why did not these distinguished gentlemen stand forth when liberty of conscience was secured by the Constitution of 1869? Because liberty of conscience in Spain still means ruin to those who embrace it, unless they be too poor to have social bonds or are too lowly to attract official persecution.

W. I. KNAPP.

FALL OF THE SALISBURY MINISTRY.

LONDON, January 30, 1886.

UP to the very morning of Thursday, January 19, when the Queen opened Parliament, there were those who hoped that Lord Salisbury's Ministry would be kept in office by dissensions in the Liberal party, and exhorted that Ministry to show themselves valiant, and win by boldness and patriotism the support of the Moderate Liberals. But, before the echoes of the Queen's speech had died from the ears of the crowd that had watched the brilliant scene in the House of Lords, men began to feel how vain were such hopes, how wasted such exhortations. The two parties confronted one another with their old hostility, and in the speech from the throne the Ministry had confessed the difficulty of its position, and its hesitation as to the policy to be pursued in Ireland. Those who counted on a coalition of moderate men on both sides perceived how potent an obstacle to any such arrangement was the presence of Mr. Gladstone, overtopping all his allies and opponents. And when the practical question arose, what sort of coercion bill ought to be presented for Ireland, by what evidence of the state of the country it must be supported, how it was to be passed against the resistance of the Irish members, the problem that lay before a Ministry in a minority looked far more formidable than the readers of newspapers had been led to believe. Curiosity and expectation had risen to a higher point than any one remembers; not only because the situation was critical, but because the tone and tendencies of the new Parliament, more than half of whose

members did not sit in the last Parliament, were an unknown but decisive factor.

The interest of the first night's debate on the address in reply to the Queen's speech centred in Mr. Gladstone's discourse; which, according to custom, followed immediately on the morning of the address. Would he admit or repudiate the views about home rule ascribed to him? Would he attack the Ministry, or promise them a truce? Would he indicate a policy of his own? He had not spoken five minutes before one thing was certain, that his oratorical power had suffered no decline. Seldom has he been more delicately wary and skilful. He praised Lord Salisbury's policy in the Bulgarian troubles. He committed himself to no positive line of policy, either as respects home rule or coercive measures, insisting that the responsibility of making proposals lay with the Ministry, and he advised the new members to reserve their judgment on the necessary course till such proposals were laid before them. He showed that as respects home rule he had not gone an inch beyond the declaration contained in his address to the electors of Midlothian last September; that no Tory speakers had attacked or censured this declaration; that the expressions used by Lord Salisbury during the campaign went quite as far toward home rule as his own. With a sarcasm so fine that it might scarcely have been perceived but for the way in which the cheers of his supporters emphasized its point, he compared the language of the Tory leaders during the election, when they were still anxious to win the Irish vote in English constituencies, with that which they now held. And in two passages of solemn eloquence, which thrilled his auditors the more by their contrast with the easy and quiet tone of the rest of his speech, he appealed to the House of Commons to give a fair and large-minded consideration to any scheme which the Nationalist members or any other members could propose for ameliorating the state of Ireland and its relations with Great Britain.

The effect of this speech on the House, and particularly on the new Liberal members, was enormous. They had come up anxious and doubting, some opposed, some fearing their constituents would be opposed to anything savoring of home rule. They were now swept away by admiration for the prowess of their leader, and seemed to see the whole landscape with different eyes. A new feeling ran through the party, and made it feel itself again compact and hopeful. Mr. Parnell followed with words carefully chosen to maintain the impression Mr. Gladstone had created. He is always calm and collected; he was now also conciliatory, deprecating excitement, minimizing difficulties, expressing no impatience. The Tory leaders were guarded; they echoed energetically the declaration in the Queen's speech against any tampering with the Act of Union, but they did not commit themselves to measures of coercion, announcing in the debate of Friday that they were sending to Ireland as Chief Secretary one of their most prominent ministers to report on the state of the country with a view to legislation. That second night's debate was marked by a long and striking speech from Mr. Sexton, restating the Parnellite position, and a warm appeal by Mr. Elliott, an Anti-Home-Rule Liberal, to the Liberal leaders—particularly to Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain—to declare themselves on the Irish question. The same line had been taken by Mr. Albert Grey on Thursday, and these speeches were significant as manifestations of the spirit of revolt in one wing of the Liberal party against the home-rule ideas attributed to Mr. Gladstone. If this so-called "Whig" wing, which has spoken out strongly through the Dukes of Bedford and Westminster, not to mention less important

peers, were really to act together against Mr. Gladstone, and to find a powerful leader in Lord Hartington or Mr. Goschen, it would become a formidable factor in the situation. It might command considerable voting power in the House of Commons, and exercise a still greater influence in the country. However, Mr. Grey and Mr. Elliott were left alone in their protests, and the opinion gained ground on Friday and Saturday that the great bulk of the party would, for the present at least, cling to Mr. Gladstone.

These also were days of feverish eagerness and excitement. Among the Tories the question was, "What shall we do about Ireland?" The idea of moving toward home rule had been dropped, if it ever seriously existed, a month before. But was a coercion bill needed? Did the state of Ireland prove the necessity? Was it prudent to break finally with the Nationalists by introducing it? Might it not be better to go out of office at once, leaving the Liberals to face the question, and reserving the right of renewing, in case the latter proposed a coercion bill, the alliance of Tories and Parnellites? On the other hand, there was English opinion to consider, still irritated by the reports of boycotting and the refusal of rent. Since the Salisbury Ministry must soon die, ought it not to die with dignity, championing the cause of order, introducing its coercion bill, and throwing on Mr. Gladstone the odium of resisting such a measure side by side with the Parnellite "enemies of the Empire"? In the Tory party itself much disappointment was expressed at the hesitating timidity of the Cabinet, and their journals told them they were losing their hold on the country and sinking to the level of a Gladstone Ministry.

The perplexities of the Liberals were not less acute. It was now plain that they would turn out Lord Salisbury when and as they pleased, for the Parnellite phalanx was prepared to vote on their side. But was it prudent to turn out the Government? Why not give it more rope, force it to discredit itself still further with the country, leave it to struggle with the difficulties its Irish policy had created, let it show its weakness in Parliamentary debate, keep it in office till the time came for it to produce its Budget, and then kill it on some financial issue? Would not the Liberal party grow stronger and more united in opposition than if, in the formation of a new Cabinet, the differences of view among its leaders stood revealed? Would not opinion in the country come round to give a more favorable consideration to schemes of home rule if an interval were allowed it for reflection before a Liberal Ministry could be called on to produce a positive policy for Ireland? These were weighty arguments, and to them was added another which, though it appealed to members of the House of Commons only, appealed powerfully to them. The Tory Ministry had tabled a series of resolutions for the improvement of Parliamentary procedure. The need of some improvements, large and sweeping improvements, is undeniable, and had been strongly urged by Mr. Gladstone in his election address. Although there were parts of the Tory proposals on the subject which the House of Commons would have rejected, and though other changes were needed which the Ministry had not proposed, the fact that they had put forward these resolutions afforded an excellent opportunity, which might not soon recur, of settling the question and establishing new rules under which all future Governments would find it easier to despatch business.

While the minds of politicians hung in this state of doubt, it occurred to them that there were certain amendments put down to the address to the Crown on which it was possible for the Ministry to be defeated. The moving