

the difficulties. No further rights of self-government here could free us from the dangers incidental to an English war. Any declaration of neutrality would be disregarded by belligerent powers, unless it were a simple declaration of independence. As long as Canada remained a colony of Britain, so long would she be liable to attack. And the only way to satisfy the conditions of the problem, the only way in which Canada could obtain a proper voice in the discussion of war questions, would either be by incorporation with, or separation from, England.

Again in the making of treaties it would be impossible that Canada, while in the position of a colony, could have the right to draw up and ratify treaties with foreign powers independently of England. In the first place, as a colony she could have no means of enforcing the observance of any treaty she might make, and it would be quite unreasonable to expect that England could be bound by, or undertake to enforce, treaties which she had no voice in making. If Canada must have a voice in the making of treaties it can only be obtained by incorporation with, or by separation from, England.

Thus, also, with the naturalization of foreigners. It is unreasonable to suppose that Canada, as a colony, could be accorded the right to pledge the protection of England to foreigners settling in her territory. England can, under the Colonial system, exert no control or supervision over a matter transacted within Canadian territory, and it would be unreasonable to expect that she would consent to make herself responsible for subjects over whom she has no control; that she would put it in the power of any colony to prepare for her innumerable troublesome questions of international rights, while the colony itself derived all the benefits from the settler and bore none of the difficulties. At the same time, also, a colony could not

appoint consuls for foreign places to watch over the interests of her people—consuls, at least, who would be recognised or have any weight with foreign powers—without having the right to treat with these foreign powers and to support the action of her consuls; and this would necessitate separation from England. In order that Canada may have the proper position and rights accorded to her people, they must either be British subjects with the complete union existing between Canada and England that this would infer, or they must be Canadian subjects with separation from England.

I do not think that, ultimately, there can be any alternative position that would satisfy the requirements of the case. When a certain stage in national growth has been reached, the change indicated must necessarily be brought about. If Federal union with England, with complete incorporation in the British Empire be not adopted, then the only other course open is separation from England, and with separation we have the alternative of annexation to the United States or Independence. It behoves everyone, therefore, who has the interest of this country at heart to consider well and dispassionately which of these three conditions will be most beneficial, which will ultimately secure the most stable form of government, and which will be most likely to ensure peace and security to the nation. It is the intuitive perception of the anomalies under which we live that has given life to recent discussion. With the growth of the country these anomalies must ever become more apparent; and ere long the question as to what change must be effected will press more vehemently for an answer. It will be the question of the day before which all others will be dwarfed. It would be well, therefore, by full discussion of the matter, to endeavour to turn the current of public opinion into channels that will finally lead to the best results, and by as complete an under-