

almost absolutely certain. It is well known that every constitution like every man, animal, vegetable, tree is a growth. Not only that but that they are as individualized by local circumstances and conditions as man is by matter. Certain forms of governments are called republican, autocratic, aristocratic, monarchic, etc. But what's in a name? France is a republic; so is the United States. Look at their written and unwritten constitution! They are different. France is really an autocratic tyranny. Democracy there is dead. An election there is not the voice of the people, it is the echo of the administration's call. England is called a limited monarchy; it is really a democracy. Asquith and the Commons make the laws and the King is permanent and hereditary President. Practically all political ideas have been born in war. The confederacy of the United States, a new thing then in politics, came into existence in 1776. The thirteen States started off with autonomies, sovereignties of their own but they agreed to surrender enough sovereignty to make a federation possible. Then piecemeal and by patchwork they fought for or purchased territory until now they have the half of North America. Canada is also a federation but it is entirely different. The British North America Act is its constitution. It is technically a colony, but now really a nation; if it has sense enough to stay on. Canada has contributed a new thing to political science which was not born in the throes and labors of war. She became a nation by bloodless evolution. The treaties with France and the United States, fiscal if you will, settled that. The British ambassadors in these places looked on in amazement while the Canadian envoys dealt directly with the aforesaid governments.

South Africa and Australia have similar constitutions and no doubt are quite as individually differentiated as those in our continent washed by the Atlantic's waters. The future alignments of the dominions or commonwealths within the Empire—or confederacy—is now being warmly debated. If there is a general council held every five years quite distinct from the present British House of Commons in which there will be an exact balance numerically between the overseas and the at-home members quite a new idea will be contributed to political science. There have been informal meetings already of colonial and imperial statesmen which were, I understand, merely consultative and advisory. Something quite different from that has to come. The war shifts locally in the overseas dominions will be enormous. But those in the motherland will be more insupportable still. This body that has been suggested would have to deal with tariffs, rebates, embargoes, preferences and the like intended mutually to assist all the