

this point there is need of clear definition. In the work of building up a nation there must needs be sentiment, without it there can be no consolidation, no strength, no permanency. A man's country is, in an enlarged sense, his home. For it he must have love, and in it he must have pride. No wise person would think of denying this. But there must be more than mere sentiment in the constitution of a nation. To have success in national life there must be community of interest in the component parts. But coming to the case of Canada, where we are anxiously appealing to sentiment among the people in settling its destiny, it is a proper question to ascertain to what and to whom the generous instincts of a lofty patriotism are due. That Canadians should love their country and bend every energy to its prosperity and glory none will deny. But here comes in the blunt question,—What is the Canadian's country? Is it Canada, or is it Great Britain? If the first and supreme obligations of patriotism belong to Great Britain, then love for Canada as such is practically treason. To state such a proposition is to demonstrate its absurdity. There is hardly a rational being within the bounds of this Dominion who will not agree that instinct as well as duty impel an unflinching love and devotion to this our own country, and inspire this as the first and irresistible impulse of every patriotic Canadian. We love our empire because it is our empire and because our interests are at this moment bound up in its common welfare. But it does not follow that the time will not come when Canadians will have a right to decide that their interests and those of Great Britain diverge and their duty demands a separate career. Let us not ignore the value and power of sentiment, but let us also see that it is properly conceived and rightly direct-

ed. If any devoted imperialist doubts the accuracy of the proposition that the period can ever arise when a colony, so-called, can honorably assume the responsibilities of a separate nationality let him suppose, if he will, that Canada shall remain a colony for the next eighty years. By that time the population will probably be about forty millions and the accumulated wealth enormous. The population of the British Isles is not likely to increase much in that period, and we shall have the problem: Great Britain forty millions and Canada forty millions.—Who will say that one country has a better right to independent national existence than the other, or that one is under any moral obligation to be a dependency of the other? I understand the contract between a colony and the parent country to be fittingly illustrated by the contract between parent and child. During the period of childhood there is to be protection on the part of the parent and obedience and devotion on the part of the child. When the child is grown up it is his duty as well as his right to seek and assume the responsibilities of life on his own account, if a son or, if a daughter, to bid a fond adieu to the old home and bathed in paternal blessings to seek a new home under entirely different auspices.

But the imperialist will say that the interests of Canada are most intimately bound up with the British Empire, and consequently the best possible course for us is to become a co-ordinate part sharing its responsibilities and its fortunes. This is a fair proposition; it is one well worthy to be discussed. But it involves another proposition absolutely essential to all discussion whatever—namely, the right of the Canadian people freely to decide the question. If the best interests of Canada are to be subserved by Imperial Federation, then I am for Imperial Federation, because