

important thought in the public mind." The Spanish families have been rooted out and "Americans have taken their place, Americans who walk about, talking of the hastening time when the American big stick will deal the little republic a coup de grace, Americans who look curiously, when not contemptuously on the native. To the Spaniard, with his air of ownership and being of the ruling race, has succeeded the American. Not only his speech, but his very walk, indicates a belief that Cuba is a subject land. The Cuban sees American pioneers raising American towns in the wilderness, he sees American capitalists buying the cultivated lands and the natives mere helots on their estates. He sees the seat of government itself made an American winter resort, with the imminent relegation of native society to that humble, below-stairs position which resident society occupies in any winter or summer resort."

However pleasing it may be to enumerate the benefits which the United States has conferred on Cuba, there is no question that the little republic exists by sufferance of its giant neighbor. So it would be exactly with an independent Canada under the Crown. Let those Canadians who think that they are now hampered under the British rule, try the new experiment and see.

Suppose that she undertook to negotiate a commercial treaty with a foreign nation, the terms of which discriminated against the Republic. How long do you think the Americans would permit such a condition of affairs to last? No matter how good the reasons might appear to Canadians for such a treaty, it could not be successfully carried out.

Or, let us suppose that Canada had a boundary or fisheries dispute with Uncle Sam. If the latter declined to arbitrate it—as he would be very apt to do—what would Canada do then? How much better would she fare than if associated with Great Britain? Or, suppose again, that Canadians resented the paternal influence of the Monroe doctrine over their affairs, and started to build a navy for their own defence. How long do you think it would be allowed to grow? To what extent could Canada deal independently with Newfoundland? In short, conceive of any Canadian policy which did not run parallel with American wishes, and you at once create a situation which means collision, sharp and fundamental. To conceive it is to condemn it, for Canada would no longer have the prestige and the power to back up her demands. Her boasted independence would be but a name. These suppositions are not imaginary, but are liable to become real conditions any day. Mr. Thomson is no doubt sincere, but his proposal is simply a half-way house to annexation. It has not been thought out to its logical consequences. It is a dangerous and impossible scheme. The link of an independent Canada to the Crown is a figment of the imagination. If Canadians went thus far, they would undoubtedly go farther and cut the painter entirely. There is no middle ground between genuine allegiance and absolute independence.

Again, the experience of other nations who have tried this plan is not satisfactory. The best examples of dual-monarchies are those of Sweden and Norway and Austro-Hungary. In the former we have two sovereign countries united under one Crown with separate legislatures. For ninety years there has been constant friction between them, and at the present moment they are quarreling over the consular service and other features of national life. Notwithstanding the indus-