

which the Government of which they were members was actually in negotiation or had been or might be? By doing so, they did something of the odium from which no special pleading will relieve them, and which no British Minister can do without forfeiting some portion at least of the respect to which his position entitles him will attach to them. The high tradition of the past should ever prevail not only in the British Isles but wherever British Constitutional rule is recognized and respected.

*The Times* thus sums up the situation in an article entitled "The charge and the apology":—

"The public will probably feel a certain sense of relief on reading the principal speeches of the Marconi debate in the House of Commons. We have no wish to treat an apology ungenerously, and we are very glad that it has been made; but we are bound to point out that neither Minister seems to understand how their conduct strikes the public. It may be put by way of a metaphor. A man is not blamed for being splashed with mud. He is commiserated. But if he has stepped into a puddle which he might easily have avoided we say that it is his own fault. If he protests that he did not know it was a puddle, we say that he ought to know better; but if he says that it was after all quite a clean puddle, then we judge him deficient in the sense of cleanliness. And the British people like their public men to have a very nice sense of cleanliness. In the speeches of both gentlemen on Wednesday, but especially in that of Mr. Lloyd George, there were too many and too vehement protestations of innocence. Neither the Attorney-General nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer is precisely fresh from the convent. Of course they had no corrupt intention. That is already admitted in the exoneration from the charge of corruption, to which, by the way, Mr. Lloyd George devoted a great deal more attention than was at all necessary, considering that he has been fully and by general consent exonerated. That charge no longer lies, and, though we deeply sympathize with him for having suffered under it, the point had no relevance to the motion or to the substance of Mr.