

ideal of overseas states peopled by Britons who treasured as their own the glories of an Imperial England, who were at home in lands widely scattered, but who never renounced the proud British citizenship with memories reaching back into a remote past. Probably when the American colonies broke away there were not a quarter of a million people of British origin living outside of the British Isles. There was no hope that these few people could share the burdens of an imperial state. They were themselves the burden. For a hundred years after the American Revolution, Canada was protected almost wholly at the expense of the British government. The colonies which remained to Britain were in truth what George III had desired the lost colonies to be, children to be protected by the parent and to give in return affection, trust, and obedience. Their political education could begin only when they were populous enough to take care of themselves.

For half a century after the American Revolution a majority of the people of Canada were of French origin with no tradition of British self-government. The British element, however, multiplied. Perhaps fifty or sixty thousand people, chiefly of English, rather than of Irish or Scottish, origin, driven out from the young republics, because of their loyalty to their king, took refuge in Canada. They were reinforced later by Irish and Scottish elements. While Canada was poor, weak in numbers, without importance compared with the wealth and power of the British Isles, it was easy to adhere to the view of parent and child. What the parent chiefly owed to the daughter state was protection, the protection of the strong for the weak. It was, of course, desirable that the people of the colony should, as far as possible, control their own local affairs. Final authority rested, however, with the mother country. It sent out a governor who was intended really to govern. Each colony had its little legislature, but this ought not to take itself too seriously. It could make laws and vote money. Over its doings, even in respect to these things, the governor kept a watchful eye and could at any time block action by refusing his consent to measures proposed. The legislature must do nothing that touched upon more than the internal interests of the colony and the judge of the import of its actions was to be the governor. It was for him to appoint to office and to dismiss from office. He had no ministers in any true sense of the word. There was no colonial cabinet which he must consult. He took advice from whom he would. Why should he not, since