

work of the kind in seven volumes, styled, as is usual, *A History of England*, disposes of the Union of England and Scotland in less than half a page, and deals with the organization of a quarter of mankind in one international state as though it were nothing more than an episode of English history. The habit of viewing the constitution of this vast international state in the light, not of Imperial history, nor even of British history, but only of English history, is largely responsible for the doctrine that any general plan for revising it to meet altered needs must be regarded from the outset as self-condemned. For in England the only experiment of the kind, the 'Instrument of Government,' which established the Protectorate in 1653, led to no permanent results. The doctrine that all such attempts are necessarily futile is a natural, though by no means a necessary, conclusion to be drawn from a study of English history in the strict sense of the term. The invariable condemnation of all such attempts as 'contrary to English history,' of which one example has been quoted above, is the practical consequence.

The moment this conclusion is viewed in the light of the history, not of England, but of the United Kingdom, it will be seen to be, not merely invalid, but wholly at variance with the truth. In point of fact the Union of England and Scotland as one commonwealth was consummated by means of a 'cut-and-dried' plan, and could not possibly have been effected in any other way. It was 'cut' in the shape of articles discussed and agreed upon by English and Scottish Commissioners appointed for that purpose in 1706, and by them drafted into the

The Anglo-Scottish Union the result of a cut-and-dried scheme.