

thoroughly that many fancy that the other side has been utterly annihilated. The other side has really not been touched. Scarcely has the conquering hero swept over the field when the enemy who was supposed to be slaughtered appears again, possibly breathless but without a wound, and with the added nerve that comes from irritation at what he deems the tyrannous use of a giant strength. Dr. Smith is not as ambitious as he has a right to be. It is a higher ambition to convert than to conquer; to inspire than to chill; to create than to criticise, especially when dealing with public questions. His bondage to prepossessions and moods, his incapacity to sympathise with ideals unfamiliar with his own experience or uncongenial to his tastes, the preponderance in him of the critical over the constructive faculties that are so necessary to the statesman, are all seen conspicuously in this volume. There is scarcely an essay in it that does not reveal one or other of those limitations, and hence the treatment of the subject, though always brilliant, is generally unsatisfactory.

In dealing, for instance, with the "Jewish Question," he points out that the anti-Semitic movement, which is becoming so general, is due not to religious fanaticism but to economic and social causes, and that the only way of stopping it is for the Jew to cease being a Jew. The fault is thrown wholly upon the Jews and not upon those who treat them with brutal violence. "The present relation," he says, "is untenable. The Jew will have either to return to Jerusalem or to forget it, give his heart to the land of his birth and mingle with humanity." But Dr. Smith will not trust to argument and moral force to bring about the consummation that is desirable, but would have the State step in and forbid the practice of circumcision. "Governments would seem entitled to restrain the practice. It has nothing to do with religious opinion, nor in repressing it would religious liberty be infringed." He might as well say that the observance of Baptism or the Lord's Supper has nothing to do with religious opinion and that governments have the right to forbid the administration of either Sacrament. Every Jew believes that circumcision was given to his forefathers as the sign and seal of the righteousness of faith. That is part of his religious faith. Though Christians believe that baptism has now taken the place of circumcision, the Jew maintains the faith of his ancestors, and any attempt to interfere with his convictions would be religious persecution. The usual results of persecution would follow in this case. The Jews would be devoted to the practice more than ever. Their law against it would be a dead letter. Their respect for us would be gone forever, and our self-respect would go at the same time. As to forgetting Jerusalem, that is more easily said than done. Why should he be obliged to forget the city that is bound up in his mind with everything that he esteems glorious in the past as well as eternally sacred? The Jew that forgets Jerusalem is not likely to be a better citizen of the country in which he lives. Granting that the hatred felt for Jews in many parts of Europe is due to social and economic causes, how does that make persecution legitimate? They charge usurious rates of interest, but the borrower is not obliged to take their money. If he can get more favorable rates, he will of course take them. Jews combine among themselves, but combines are not confined to one race or

creed. Dr. Smith, however, has not a word to say against their persecutors; and, instead of denouncing Russia for decreeing the expulsion of millions, he attributes to party politics a protest in the United States against the monstrous edict. His language is a good illustration of the art of putting things. "As it is," he says, "Western Europe and the Western Hemisphere are threatened with a fresh invasion on the largest scale by the departure (*sic*) of Jews from Russia. American politics are already beginning to feel the influence. A party to catch the Jewish vote puts into its platform a denunciation of Russia, the best friend of the American Republic in its day of trial." (P. 259).

In the next essay the only solution proposed for the "Irish Question" is along the same lines. Irishmen must cease to be Irish. The map has settled the question that there must not be anything like a Council, Legislature, or Parliament sitting in Dublin to settle Irish affairs. "The map shows at once that the destinies of the Islands are linked together. The two will, in all probability, either be united or be enemies, and if they are enemies, woe to the weaker." That means woe to the weaker in any case, if the union has been accomplished by fraud or is maintained only by force. He forgets his own quotation, that "you can do anything with bayonets but sit upon them." Neither does it occur to him that after the House of Commons has decided that Ireland is entitled to a measure of Home Rule, bayonets are out of the question and that some other solution must be tried. "The resources of civilization are not exhausted," though Mr. Gladstone's second bill is as dead as his first. To quote Mommsen to the effect that the Celtic race is "politically worthless" certainly does not settle anything. In the mouth of a statesman or publicist, it is the language of despair. Even were it true, the race is still there and certain to remain there. Some way of lessening, as far as possible, the occasions of friction between it and the stronger race with which it must always be politically united will assuredly be found. In the meanwhile, every true friend of the Empire will try to exercise patience and to abstain from the use of vitriolic language.

The next essay deals with "Prohibition in Canada and the United States," and in it we find that Dr. Smith has swung to an opposite extreme. He has no word of condemnation for the wholesale deportation of Jews or for mob violence directed against the innocent and the guilty alike, but his sympathies are deeply moved as he thinks of what tavern-keepers suffer. "Their treatment has been utterly iniquitous," because they do not get compensation when their trade is interfered with by legislation. Legislation is always interfering with trade; a change in the tariff may create or wipe out an industry. Railways or canals build up one city at the expense of another. Thousands suffer loss in these and other ways, and yet no one hints at compensation. Of course, compensation for saloon and tavern keepers is a legitimate subject for discussion, but a thoughtful writer might remember that the traffic in strong drink has brought as grievous woes on society, and especially on its slaves, as Jewish usurers have inflicted on their victims, and might remember too the important fact that those who have gone into the business have done so with their eyes open to the existence of a strong party pledged to do

everything possible to abolish the traffic, as speedily as they can, by constitutional means.

In the essay on the "Empire" his moods and prepossessions and the inconsistencies into which these lead him are seen most clearly. I may be permitted to cite two cases in which he is condemned by his own language elsewhere, although the whole essay should be read by all who wish to make a great empire little.

When desirous of pointing out that the supremacy of the United Kingdom over the self-governing colonies has been reduced to a shadow, he quotes a colonial governor, who "to pay a compliment to his colony denied that it was a dependency at all." Anxious to impress upon us that such language was meaningless flattery or buncombe, he goes on to say: "But a community which receives a governor from an Imperial country; whose constitution is imposed upon it by the Act of an Imperial Parliament; which has not the power of amending its constitution; which has not the power of peace and war, of making treaties, or of supreme justice; play with language as you will, is a dependency. It has and can have no place among the nations." (P. 150). Now, let us read his description of our position, when he wishes to point out that Irish Home Rule would lead to separation. "It is needless," he says, "to discuss again the false, and for the most part, absurd analogies which have been adduced to lull the British people into dismemberment; . . . that of Canada, a colony three thousand miles off and virtually independent." When it suits one argument, Canada is "a dependency," and when it suits another, Canada is "virtually independent." Would it not be well for him to decide what our position really is, and to decide the question on its merits and not for the purpose of arguing one way or the other? We have a right to expect from a man, whose historical knowledge ought to raise him above mere constitutional pedantry, a recognition of the great fact that Canada has been steadily rising from a dependency into the position of a sharer of the Imperial sovereignty. He must be well aware that no treaty affecting it can now be made without the presence of its representatives as Imperial commissioners and without the free consent of its Parliament. Mr. Secretary Fish in 1870, and Mr. Secretary Blaine in 1890, believing that they understood the British constitution better than Her Majesty's Ministers, remonstrated with them on the impropriety of making Canada a party in negotiations between Britain and the States; but Goldwin Smith would hardly care to be in the same boat with those gentlemen, or with the American representatives on the Behring Sea commission, whose whole aim was to prove that no one was giving any trouble or objecting to their preposterous claims but Canada, and that a colony had no constitutional status whatsoever. If however, the mantle of the Bourbons has fallen on him also, he should read the chapter on our constitution in Mr. O. A. Howland's "New Empire," and endeavor to digest the now accepted principle that, with regard to Canada, at any rate, "the nominally exclusive exercise of sovereignty by the Home Government takes its place among the numerous legal fictions which are so common in our constitutional experience." But, if he cannot understand our position from inability to recognize that the principle of growth is inherent in the British constitution, at all