

opinion favorable to the international peace and arbitration, it is decidedly advantageous and powerful.

Most of those foreigners — and this applies also to a certain extent to the people of the British Isles — have come to Canada largely because they were given to understand that Canada is a country where peace, order and liberty prevail, a country free from the entanglements of international rivalries, with their dreadful sequel of conscription, of military and naval budgets, of heavy taxation, of the burdens of armed peace and the horrors of war.

They can easily be enrolled in the ranks of the persistent opponents of military Imperialism and blatant jingoism.

The longer the non-British preserve their ethnical characteristics, the better disposed they will be to accept and uphold the principles of arbitration, which would lessen if not altogether suppress the causes of conflict between their native land and Great Britain. They will also view with favour any movement to assert the right of Canada to remain neutral in British wars not directly connected with the interests and safety of Canada, — in those wars especially in which their fatherland may be drawn.

If that doctrine of colonial neutrality, which was practically acknowledged by Great Britain fifty years ago, finally prevailed over the new imperialistic tendencies, even before Canada could assert it as a nation or a co-partner of Great Britain, it would have a beneficent and far-reaching influence upon the councils of Great Britain. It might, for example, induce the British government to change their views with regard to the proposal made by Mr. Choate, in the name of the United States, at the Hague conference, in 1907, to abolish the practice of piracy on sea in time of war, — which proposal, though approved by two thirds of the delegates present, was left in suspense principally on account of the opposition raised by the representatives of Great Britain.

Let us hope that the next conference will see the same proposition renewed, accepted by Great Britain, and put into practice by all maritime powers.

Its adoption would free Canada from even the semblance of a pretence to enter into the dangerous game of naval armaments, either on her own account or as a contributor to the British naval organisation.

* * *

The most important factor, perhaps, in the education of Canada as an upholder of peace and arbitration lies in her long preliminary stage as a dependency.

Viewed from that angle, the state of colonial subjection and irresponsibility, detrimental as it has been to the intellectual and material development of Canada, may have a marked and beneficent effect on her future course, either as an independent nation or as a powerful partner in a British Confederacy.

On her own account, Canada has had no quarrel with any one. She has no conquest to answer for, no wound to heal, no grudge to satisfy, no claim to adjust, either subjectively or objectively. For many years to come, she will have no need of colonies, no shadow of a pretence to covet new territory — not even the "pious" desire of conquering, stealing, bullying or killing "inferior races", in order to inculcate in them the tenets and habits of a "superior civilisation". The great "christian" powers have hardly left her any chance of entering that field of "education" and "improvement", of assuming her share of the "white man's burden".

Once the safety of trade secured on sea, there remains in the world but one country with which Canada can be in trouble: the United States.

May I devote the latter part of these remarks to a brief consideration of what the relations of Canada with the United States have been, in the