

Sir John Seeley in his *Expansion of England*, an epoch-making work in Imperial matters, shows that the modern state necessarily colonizes in a different way from the Greek state. To the Greek mind State and City were identical terms. The city was the unit. He who left the City left the State and helped to form a new state. But the modern usage is to consider emigrants as carrying the State along with them. Where Frenchmen go, France goes. Where Englishmen go, there is England. According to this view Canada would be as integral a part of England as the County of Kent, and the question of its severance from the British Crown would be as little entertained as the proclamation of the independence of Kent. If this idea had prevailed, there would be no Canadian question, no Imperial Federation. Canadians would simply be Britishers over seas. This idea, however, says Seeley, became mixed up with another idea drawn from the practice of the most harsh and despotic of colonizing powers, the Spanish Monarchy. The Colony in the New World, which, according to the one view, was merely an extension of the motherland, an immense shire added to its territory, was, according to the other and more Spanish view of it (and the distance of the colonies from the central point of government gave the preponderance to this latter conception) a dependency, a possession, a something therefore to be used for the benefit of the possessor. The colonies, the American colonies for instance, were regarded as a source of wealth and valued as such. The colonies found a profitable market in England as well. Mutual interest united each to the other, and in spite of the natural bonds of blood and