

for an entirely separate existence. As the Hon. George Brown pointed out, there were forty-eight sovereign nations in Europe, and thirty-seven of them (including Portugal, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, Saxony, Hanover, and Greece) had less population than united Canada; and Sweden and Norway, Belgium and Bavaria had very little more.¹ Was it not time, then, thought these men, that British North America should take on the dignity and importance, the privileges and responsibilities of nationhood, with the queen for their sovereign, and in alliance with the United Kingdom?

Nation or Colony?—Once again in our history has it become somewhat fashionable to speak of Canada as a nation. Sir Wilfrid Laurier would educate us to the use of the word, and it was his government that suggested that the words "King of Canada" should be one of the King's titles. Lord Rosebery proposed that instead of "King of all the British Dominions beyond the Seas," it should read "King of Britains," because, he said, "It takes away from the title any sense of colony or dependency, which I think all who wish well to the Empire must be anxious to remove" (Hansard, 1898, 4th Sess., p. 528). Mr. Chamberlain speaks of us and our congeners as "sister states." Kipling, too, renounces the depreciatory term, and bids us be nations (Reinsch, p. 270). And, finally, the Marquis of Lorne, just before leaving Canada, said to us, "You are not the subjects, but the allies, of a great country, the country that gave you birth." (Reply to farewell address by Commons.)

But in spite of poetry and all declamation, we are not a nation; although what we are exactly is a little difficult in a word to express.

The editor of Sir George Cornwall Lewis's "Government of Dependencies" would scientifically describe us as a pro-

¹ Whelan, p. 32.