

years illustrates the practical effect of this difference. In 1872 the Ministry of the day carried a bill through the House of Commons abolishing the system of purchase in the army. The bill was rejected by the Lords. The Cabinet then discovered that purchase could be abolished by Royal Warrant—*i.e.*, by something very like the exercise of the prerogative. The system was then and there abolished. The change, it will probably be conceded, met with the approval, not only of the Commons, but of the electors. But it will also be conceded that, had the alteration required statutory authority, the system of purchase might have continued in force up to the present day. The existence of the prerogative enabled the Ministry in this particular case to give immediate effect to the wishes of the electors, and this is the result which under the circumstances of modern politics the survival of the prerogative will in every case produce. The prerogatives of the Crown have become the privileges of the people": (Law of the Constitution, pp. 392-394).

The example cited by Mr. Lecky of the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown by the Cabinet as a privilege of the people is peculiarly significant if we remember that the fiercest contest between Charles I. and the Parliament was in reference to the control of the army. The prerogative, however, which was claimed by Charles I. for a personal purpose, has been exercised in our own times by Ministers of the Crown in the interests of the people, whose servants they acknowledge themselves to be. The Royal prerogative debate in the House of Lords and the Archer Shee debate in the House of Commons, as illustrations of this great development of our Constitution, are of supreme value.—*Law Times*.