

of that foreign land, and adopt those of the country in which they come to dwell, speak its language, and read its literature. In Canada that must be English or French or both. Those coming should not think that by their arrival they are conferring on us a special favour and are therefore entitled to special privileges. We are willing to share with them our rights as citizens, if they are willing to accept with us all the obligations of citizenship, and to conform to national ways and give the earnest of it by actually doing so. If they are not thus willing, Canada is better off without them.

To what extent will the "Conflict of Laws" be still applied to people from enemy countries whose atrocities have shocked and hardened the hearts of all nations who have suffered from their fieridishness. Legislation which reflects public sentiment will express that indignation. It will also be shewn in international relations. Will not the test in the British Commonwealth and the United States be nationality and not domicile as in the past, thus following the Code Napoleon? To a limited extent United Kingdom legislation has already made it so (see Trading with Enemy Act, 1916). But what of international law (public)? I have heard lawyers say it is an ideal not a fact, an ideal that has been brushed aside and sneered at by the Central Powers because it did not suit their convenience and, to the extent to which reprisal was necessary to save themselves and smaller nations from extinction, sidestepped limitedly by the British Commonwealth and its Allies. The Hun has been insisting that as Germany is the dominant world power it can disregard international law, and enforce what rules of conduct it pleases on all other States and make those rules positive law. Some writers hold that international law may be an expression of natural law or an emanation of the fundamental second commandment, crude, but sufficient to warn an evilly disposed State; that as civilization advanced international law changed form from time to time to express the public opinion of well disposed peoples touching the rights and obligations of States to each other; that it grew naturally as the common law and equity in England to suit new conditions evolved out of saner ideas and juster dispositions. Austin maintained that a