

tectorate; for, as is well known, a protectorate implies personal supervision of foreign affairs, rather than political incorporation, or physical dominion (Reinsch, p. 100). In this view protector and protectorate is the beginning and ending of political paternal association. An empire may declare a protectorate, for example, over Uganda; elevate it afterward to a Crown colony; then to a colony with legislative powers, but no responsible government; next to a self-governing colony; and when the power of self-government is complete, Uganda would again become a protectorate, having mere personal relation once more with the dominant state. But Canada is not a protectorate, for she is still under tutelage.

More frequently Canada is thought of as a self-governing colony; but we resent the "colony," and are unable to allege complete powers of self-government. There is no category in which, strictly speaking, we can be placed; and I desire for two purposes to ask you to inquire with me to-night into the precise nature of the relation which at the present moment exists between us and our political associates: first, that we may clearly understand what that relation is, and, second, that, so understanding, we may the more readily and intelligently envisage the future.

From among the many different definitions of a nation, we may select as common to the most authoritative of those referring to its political rather than its ethnographical signification, the condition that it "is a complete, or self-sufficient body of free persons" (Grotius); that it is "self-existent, autonomous, and sovereign" (W. P. Johnston); and that it is "capable of maintaining relations with all other governments" (Field, "International Code," 2d ed., p. 2. See Morse, "Citizenship by Birth and by Naturalization," p. 3). Canada's political position, I regret to say, falls very far short of these requisites of nationality.