

constitutional law, and have done so under pretense of executing a great public policy which could have been more easily effected lawfully, constitutionally and with honour." Thus the Democrats. The control of the Isthmian Canal could have been obtained in a more honourable way. That is all. What of German Imperialism? It has travelled a long way during a century. In 1809 self-defence was the watch-word. "We must prove that we are worthy of our country by showing others that we know how to defend it. If we show that we are unworthy of such a trust then we shall go under." So wrote Blücher to the Prussian King in October, 1809. Now we have it on good authority that "contact with official Germany has done much to reconcile the Boer to his lot under the British flag." As for France, the general conviction seems to be that her colonial policy is largely a failure; too much exploitation, too little development.

Russia we need scarcely discuss.

In the course of these remarks my contention has been that you must judge Imperialism broadly. The means by which the Empire has been extended was illustrated from Egypt and South Africa, two of the most recent and severely criticized phases of its development. A possible means of promoting the Empire has been rapidly characterised in our glimpse into Chamberlain's policy. It is impossible to traverse the whole story of Empire-building. There are blots upon the record, but on the whole it will appear that the pages are clean. You will find things that no one will defend. But you must beware of judging a Warren Hastings by

modern standards; he is to be judged by the standards of his age and generation. That folly and crime were and are possible in the name of the flag detracts from the merits, the resplendent merits, of the whole system. That is true even although we hold that the sovereign people is absolved from direct connivance or even if we go further and hold that nothing infamous was ever condoned by the people, the agent ultimately responsible. We may even claim that the reproach of wrongs committed in the past has been wiped out by measures now taken to render flagrant misconduct impossible. You can hardly ask more from a nation than that. And in estimating merits and demerits, in apportioning blame and praise you must never lose sight of the contemporary doings of rival nations. "Blind folly, ignoble selfishness, crushing tyranny, and hideous cruelty mark every page of the history of the domination of Spain." Thus Lecky. Does the world owe nothing to the British seamen who broke that power, the power to which the United States dealt but the finishing blow? It is the fashion of unthinking philanthropes to condemn warfare wholesale, but war is only the final test of the purity and vitality of a nation's ideals. And on the whole might goes with right, just because if the national ideals are sound so far will the nation be strong.

British administrators have made many mistakes and have many faults, quite sufficient to render the whole structure, which carries these blunders on its shoulders, imperfect—as human handiwork is wont to be. The basis upon which it is founded, the basis of well-meaning effort for the common good will scarcely admit