1883

deve

depe

coun

Engl

have

which

strei

rich

will

the

and

anoi

and

by

Ŵh

tall

of

anc

ami

tim

will

wit

bat

On

and

tric

sea

his

sho

stil

as

wa

hu

pir

col

so lar

gr

gr

no Ol su

va

th

br

th

er

future career of Canada, to prevent the progress of an annexation sentiment in the country. Indeed Canadians have so much practical work on hand for years to come, especially in the North-west Territory, that they have literally no time to devote to theoretical speculations about their future destiny. When the Dominion has a population above 10,000,000—probably by the end of a decade—Canadians may aspire to a higher position among communities. Whether this great dependency will become a more active partner in the empire —in that imperial federation which was foreshadowed by James Otis,1 and is the aspiration nowadays of not a few far-seeing statesmen,2-is a question which must be left to the solution of time. Canada is pursuing her work of development under the most favonrable circumstances. She enjoys all the security and prestige which connection with the empire can give her. She is bound by the closest ties of commercial interest and family affection to the powerful nation on her borders. European complications are not likely to endanger her peace whilst England can perform police duties on the seas. The questions which agitate the public mind are simply ques-

tions of provincial interest which can be easily arranged. It is the hope of the Canadian people, who are making all possible sacrifices, and exerting their best energies to develop the resources of their country, that they will meet with that cordial sympathy from the parent State which will be at once a guarantee of success and a reward for their fidelity to the empire. And when the time comes for solving the question of the destiny of Canada, it will be well both for her and the empire if it be left to the decision of statesmen possessing the foresight and the breadth of view of the late Lord Beaconsfield. Imperialism is a word which certain political critics have been wont to construe only in a derogatory sense; but a Canadian writer may be allowed to say, that a policy which makes England a real influence and power in the conneils of Europe, and at the same time promotes the unity of the empire by attaching due importance to the possession of colonies, is, after all, that policy which is deserving of the approval and support of true Englishmen all the world over.

Only a few words in concluding a paper which is necessarily but a brief review of some leading features of the material and political

of the heat of and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Bancroft's Constitution of the United States, vol. i. p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Since this article was put in type, the principle of colonial federation has received powerful support from a speech delivered at Edinburgh by a distinguished Canadian, Sir Alexander Galt, G.C.M.G., in the course of which he said: "He was quite prepared to say that, as regards everything, there could be no doubt federation would be an unmixed good. It would certainly tend to consolidate the empire, to bring the inherent elements of strength more directly under the control of the principal Government, and increase its influence and strength. The general principle would be simply the consolidation of the general interests which concern us all, whether east or west, north or south—the consolidation of those under one general Legislature, and the localising of the sectional questions which were not imperial. . . . There were certain local questions which they could deal with better than anybody else could; and he believed that, as regards the general question, it would be very much better if they were dealt with by all whose interests were really embarked in it. . . . The truth was the empire was growing beyond the present system; and he hoped that as the necessity for further changes came, those changes might seek a direction which would give vitality and permanence to the British empire."