

wishes. So may the State of Prussia, in the German Empire. So may even the State of New York, in the American Commonwealth. King George V. may throw the whole of Great Britain into war or revolution to-morrow if he wishes. A recalcitrant attitude on the Parliament Bill would probably, indeed, cause a revolution of some kind. Who can compel his hand to move if he refuse to move it himself in the required direction? It is even open to the humblest citizen of any state to break his legally binding contracts if he wishes. Even the Criminal Code does not bind a man against his will. The philosophy of the matter is elementary. The prerogative of free action, although sometimes attributed to nations, is ultimately vested in individuals alone. Nations have no freedom, while, on the other hand, no power in existence can compel an individual to do what he ultimately refuses to do. We prefer, however, to proceed on the assumption that men will keep their contracts and obey the law. Indeed, society could not exist on any other assumption. We prefer, therefore, in this matter of Canada's relation to Great Britain, to proceed on the assumption that Canada will honourably perform her obligations. The question again is not what Canada may do, but what in honour and in law she ought to do.

Mr. Ewart next discusses the relation of Canada to British wars. Here also he maintains that Canada has plainly asserted her independence of Great Britain. This contention he bases for the most part on certain declarations made by Canada and Australia at the Conference of 1902 and upon another declaration made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the Canadian House of Commons in 1910. By this latter declaration the Premier of Canada declared that we shall or shall not take part in British wars as we think proper. Both this declaration, however, and the argument which Mr. Ewart bases upon it,

are also hopelessly wide of the mark. The mark is that we are already, by mere force of our colonial relationship, exposed to attack by the enemies of Great Britain. So long as we remain a British colony every acre of Canadian soil and every Canadian port is liable to be made a British battlefield. It is the very existence of the Colonies, indeed, and the prospect that they may eventually unite with the Motherland into a powerful federation which forms the chief provoking cause of jealousy felt towards Great Britain by other nations. The most probable cause of any attack which might be made upon Great Britain would be, therefore, to separate her and her colonies and thus prevent all possibility of this proud federation ever coming to maturity. In such a war, indeed, Canada would be especially interested. No one can look at the map, and, noting Canada's strategic position between two oceans, her vast territory and resources, and the almost unlimited opportunity she offers of British expansion, and not draw the conclusion that an attack upon Great Britain virtually means an attack upon the Anglo-Canadian union. Should war be made upon Great Britain now the first point of attack might well be the Port of Halifax, in Nova Scotia, the obvious purpose being to cut off Great Britain's food supply from Canada, to prevent her using Nova Scotian coaling stations, and to preclude any possible dispatch of ships, men, or arms from Canadian ports. If the seat of war were the Orient our Pacific ports would also be carefully watched by the enemy in order to prevent the transport of British troops over Canadian railways, a privilege which we cannot deny to Great Britain as long as her flag floats over Canadian soil. That our shores in any case would be grievously harassed by the enemy there can be little doubt. Imagine Canada, then, devoid as she is of men and ships, proclaiming her neutrality un-