

therefore, to what extent it answers its purpose as a remedy against disruption. Let me first of all refer to a contribution to the March number of the "Round Table" by a prominent Canadian politician, by whom in all seriousness the following question is put :-

"Is there a place in the British Commonwealth of Nations for Canada, if she becomes a sovereign State precisely as Great Britain is a sovereign State?"

To which question the writer answers as follows:-

"This is the question to which Canadian nationalists want an answer. Obviously if there is room in the British Commonwealth of Nations for Great Britain as an independent nation, but no room for any other independent nation, Canada and the other Dominions are not nations, are not equal to Great Britain, but are in fact glorified colonies pretending in the face of the world to be something which they are not".

I feel convinced that when a public man of authority in a country such as Canada feel and speaks like this, all that can be said is that the principle upon which we have been engaged in building up- the Empire since 1919 is more calculated to bring about its fall than to serve as a foundation for its future existence.

It is clear that a Dominion such as Canada wishes to see in its equal status real international independence, and that if it is prevented under the regime of the existing group-unity idea from obtaining that independence, it will be compelled to obtain it along a different way. The national aspirations of the peoples of the young Dominions are too forceful to be satisfied with mere appearance, where the reality has become a necessity.

But apart from the question in how far the theory of the Unity of the Group satisfies the national demands of the Dominions, I wish to answer the question briefly as to what extent that theory has proved to be feasible in practice.

The /...