

war, or the easy indifference of Canada to the consequences of war.

Such a state of things is matter for serious reflection. Freedom has its duties as well as its rights; why should the mother-country exert herself to defend colonies that will not fight for themselves?—why retain in her family, and under the protection of her name, insolent and disobedient children?

Duties of the mother-country and the Colonies reciprocal.

The view taken by the Colonies is characteristic. They deem it to be with England a question of the pocket, not of honour; they think the mother-country derives such substantial advantages from her Colonies that she dares not without a struggle abandon so great a prize to the possible domination of foreign countries.

Colonies imagine that they are too valuable to be abandoned.

The only mode of testing the truth of the case made by the Colonies is to examine the various modes in which colonies ancient and modern have been, or have been supposed to be, advantageous to the countries from which they sprang; if the conclusion be that, in any of those modes, England has been benefited, it must be admitted, to the extent of that benefit, she has incurred a debt to her colonies which she cannot justly refuse to pay.

Examination of value of colonies.

The old and simple token by which, in ancient times, a colony acknowledged its dependence on the mother-country was by payment of a tribute.

Colonies in ancient times paid tribute.

Athens, as soon as she had escaped from the dangers of the great Persian expedition, employed her ascendancy in reducing her allies to subjection, and compelling them to pay into the treasury of Athens, by way of tribute, the amount which they had previously voluntarily contributed to Delos in furtherance of the common cause.\*

Athenian colonies.

\* Lewis on the Government of Dependencies, p. 102.