

ways remain sufficiently ahead of us to enable them to array against us a force which would crush any that we could oppose to it; and so long as this should be the case we would hold our political life at the pleasure of our neighbours. Should it be said that this is barbarous, drum-and-trumpet philosophy, utterly unworthy of the nineteenth century, the reply is that it is no less a stubborn fact. Mr. Fitzjames Stephen hits the simple truth when he tells us that: "War and conquest decide all the great questions of politics, and exercise a nearly decisive influence in many cases upon religion and morals. We are what we are because Holland and England in the sixteenth century defeated Spain, and because Gustavus Adolphus and others successfully resisted the Empire in Northern Germany." Or, as Mr. Stephen might have said still more forcibly, we are what we are because, so far off as eleven centuries since, Charles Martel crushed the Saracens on the plains of Tours, but for which event, to use the sneering, but truthful, language of Gibbon, "perhaps the interpretation of the Koran would now be taught in the halls of Oxford, and her pulpits might demonstrate to a circumcised people the sanctity and truth of the religion of Mahomet." It is the same on this American continent, and in this nineteenth century. The Union is in its present position to-day simply because Lee failed to rout his foes at Gettysburg. And thus will the world continue to be to the end of the chapter, for the simple reason that, in the words of Dean Milman, "when men feel strongly they act violently." In the opening lines of "The English in Ireland," Mr. Froude enunciates the theory that "when two countries, or sections of countries, stand geographically so related to one another that their union under a common government will conduce to the advantage of one of them, such countries will continue separate as long only as there is equality of force between them, or as long as the country which desires to maintain its independence possesses a power of resistance so vigorous that the effort to overcome it is too exhausting to be permanently maintained." I have no doubt that Mr. Froude is right in so thinking; but I do not undertake to defend his position, since all needful in the present instance can be established much more easily than by attempting to demonstrate its truth. That a Canadian

nationality would stand in the position of the weaker country in the above illustration is patent; and that its powers of resistance would be tested, has already been shown to be at least probable. To call it into existence, in the face of these facts, would be simply equivalent to the action of a stage manager who announces the performance of a play without providing for the part of the central character.

If this be the case it follows that, if we wish to obtain security against annexation, we can do so only by placing our relations with the Fatherland on a mutually satisfactory basis. The only matters in which any readjustment is needed are the duties and privileges of the several parts of the Empire in reference to diplomacy, armaments, commerce, and finance. On all other matters no objection is made to each member acting for itself; but on these mutual complaints are heard. Hence, to obviate the danger of dispute and collision, all that is requisite is that they should arrive at a clear settlement of their relative duties on these points, and secure adherence to it by placing the administration of its provisions in the hands of a legislature in which all parties to the settlement should be proportionately represented. These things once done, the *FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE* would be an accomplished fact.

Here, however, the Imperialist at once encounters a loud shout to the effect that unity may be indefinitely prolonged under the present polity, but that to attempt to establish an Imperial Federation on equal terms for all is to seal the disruption of the Empire. What is this but to allege that unity may be maintained in connection with the present anomalies and incongruities, but not without them? Is not this something very like starting the argument against Federation with a transparent inconsistency?

But, not insisting on this point, let us pass on to the next. It is alleged that it would be impossible to arrive at such an understanding, or to form such a legislature. I believe that it would be very easy to arrive at such an understanding, because each party could supply what the other would value. The difficulty arises from the unequal distribution of the powers, privileges, burdens, and responsibilities of nationality. Let England agree to share its powers and privileges with the Colonies; and the Colo-