

drafted into a bill and placed before them for discussion? In truth this condemnation of those who test proposals they advance by drafting them into schemes has its roots in a shrinking from public discussion and a distrust of public opinion.

The
German
method.

More curious still is the attempt to brand such procedure as a method copied from Germany. As every student of German history knows, that union was effected by two different methods. The first consisted in forcible conquest and annexation by Prussia of such territories as Silesia, Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, and a portion of Hesse. In these cases the necessity for drafting a constitution was avoided by the use of force. Otherwise the union of Germany was effected by agreements rendered possible only by a previous display of force. But even so, the agreement necessitated the drafting of a constitution. The manner in which this draft was prepared, discussed, and adopted is in strange contrast to the methods adopted in the Anglo-Scottish Union and in Canada, Australia, and South Africa. 'By a treaty of August 18, 1866, all the North German States which had survived entered into a treaty with one another and with Prussia; they mutually guaranteed each other's possessions, engaged to place their forces under the command of the King of Prussia, and promised to enter into a new federation; for this purpose they were to send envoys to Berlin who should agree on a Constitution, and they were to allow elections to take place by universal suffrage for a North German Parliament before which was to be laid the draft Constitution agreed upon by the envoys of the