

whatever. If he were to revisit 'Fatherland' on a summer's excursion, he could be immediately drafted by the German authorities to perform military duty. Any appeal to the British Consul would be fruitless: he is not a British subject. No matter how long he may have resided in Canada—no matter what oath of allegiance he may have taken—no matter how he may have become incorporated with the political institutions of the country—he yet remains in the national code a subject of Germany. Whenever he leaves Canadian territory, he finds that he has no national standing; he finds that there is no person or power out of Canada to whom he can appeal for aid in distress, or protection from injury. British consuls would not recognise him as a British subject; Canadian consuls—there are none, and can be none so long as the country occupies the position of a mere colony.

It scarcely needs to be pointed out how such a condition of things must militate against the material prosperity and national growth of a country. Apart from the undignified position in which it places its people among the nations of the world, one has only to reflect upon the effect it must have on any foreigner when selecting a place to which to emigrate, to see that it must greatly check the stream of emigration to the country, or divert it to other places. It cannot be otherwise but that a German, understanding this position of affairs, and understanding, at the same time, that upon going to the United States he would be immediately admitted into the full rights of citizenship, and afforded the protection of the United States Government wherever he might go, would be strongly, and not without reason, induced to accept the United States as the land of his adoption, rather than Canada. In the battle for emigrants this must be a powerful weapon in the hands of the United States agents.

I think the impartial consideration of these three positions of the question will convince any one that the political status of Canada is not a permanent one; that the national growth of the country must be accompanied by a growth and expansion of political control; and that in time the material well-being of the country, as well as the national instincts, will require that Canada should have a voice in the matters affecting her supreme legislation. If Canada is liable to be drawn into expensive and bloody wars, then must she have a voice in approving or disapproving of these wars. If the commercial prosperity of Canada depends largely upon the making of treaties with foreign countries, then must she have a voice in drawing up and ratifying those treaties. If the growth of the population of Canada depends largely upon the stream of foreign immigration attracted to her shores, then must she have a proper position accorded to her, in order to be able to protect and guard these settlers. It would be contrary to the teachings of history, contrary to the genius of human nature, and contrary to the dictates of common sense, to imagine that Canada—no matter what growth or development she may attain to—must ever remain in a position of voiceless submission to England in matters affecting her supreme legislation. In the nature of things a change must occur, perhaps, at no very distant date, and it would be wise to be prepared for it, and to endeavour to foresee what change would be best.

We may see beforehand what in a general way the nature of that change must be. In order to obviate the difficulties and anomalies seen under the three foregoing aspects, the change cannot be in the direction of a further expansion of the Colonial System. Already we, as colonists, have more uncontrolled action than is quite compatible with the stability of a permanent empire. An expansion of the Colonial System could not meet