and frankly expressed as real convictions to an American audience, was an outstanding triumph.

No one can deny that the hearts of the rank and file of the Liberal party of Canada have been intrinsically sound in their Canadianism. The leaders of the Liberal party have not been so fortunately placed. Passing over such acts and disloyal speeches as Sir Wilfred Laurier's famous "Saskatchewan speech," we can at most say of him that he never became thoroughly seised of a sound British loyalty. He was at most a loyal "little Canadian"; true to Canada as such, but having no Imperial vision.

Mackenzie King and his coadjutors are either pro-Americans or what might justly be termed political opportunists, as far as patriotism is concerned, or like Sir Wilfred Laurier, "little Canadians."

Yet from a field so unpromising has sprung one who has a real and vital patriotism, a true national

message and ideal. We greet him with joy. May the spirit that filled the loyal men and women who won from the Canadian forests, amid mighty difficulties, a British Canada, keep and sustain him and give to his tongue such convincing eloquence as will shape and strengthen our national spirit in its true and proper form and channel!

It is probably too much to expect that Graham's influence and example should change Mackenzie King's patriotism into something worthy of an outstanding Canadian. Such would seem too great an accomplishment for our day. With Graham's case before us, however, we may even perhaps hope that such an unexpected thing might happen. Meanwhile, Graham, we hail you as a great Canadian, all the greater because you are great in patriotic vision in spite of the influences of those who surround you.

A Study in Canadian Citizenship

By IRA A. MACKAY, M.A., LL.B., Ph. D. of McGill University

CONCLUSION OF THE PROBLEM OF not one question, but a whole complex of would they be able to retain their inde-CANADA AND THE EMPIRE

After the foregoing broken and very from the B. N. A. Act and so become sibilities, real or imaginary, of complete imperfect analysis, we are now at least an independent nation, monarchy or re-political annexation to the United States? in a position to answer the question of public as the case may be? Are there Or if they decide to retain the British Canada's future relation to the Empire ten people in Canada who would answer monarchy as at present should they insist a little more intelligently. The question this question in the affirmative? If the that the Governor-General be chosen by

questions. Should Canada take steps to pendence for any length of time or would have all references to the Crown deleted they soon be overwhelmed with the posis, we are now in a position to recognize, people of Canada become independent, the King solely on the advice of his Can adian ministers? Should the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the King's Privy Council be continued or discontinued or should the Committee be enlarged into a really efficient Court capable of administering the numerous systems of law in the different parts of the Empire? Should the power of the Parliament at Westminster to make laws and extend them to Canada be abrogated and the Parliament of Canada made the sole, final, supreme legislative body on all Canadian matters home and foreign, including the power to amend her own constitution or to make a wholly new constitution should she so desire? What would the people of Quebec say to that? Is Canada in a financial position to maintain a foreign diplomatic service of her own and would it be profitable in an economic way for her to do so? Should sections 55, 56 and 57 be struck out of the B. N. A. Act forever and a day? Should the Imperial Conferences be continued or discontnued? These and many similar questioins must be answered before any answer can be given to the larger question and until all these questions are carefully and candidly considered, all discussion on the general issue is always virtually futile and often mischievous.

Indeed, as we have already indicated, the method of abstract controversy, often prompted by merely selfish and partisan interests, has long prevailed far too widely in the study of political problems. A large number of these problems such, for example, as free trade and protection. capital and labour, private and public ownership, nationalism and internationalism, autonomy and empire, are really at bottom bookmen's puzzles and contain at best a very large element of a well-known logical fallacy, the fallacy known to the mediaeval philosophers as the fallacy of dichotomy or cutting the problem in two and to modern logicians as the "either-or" fallacy. The trouble is that we take tv

