

the settlement of the terms of peace. The great war has made the Empire "more conscious of itself," and it is the part of wise and prudent statesmanship to promote every movement that will help it to follow up the advantage thus gained.

CERTAIN speeches recently delivered in Montreal— notably those of Mr. James Beck before the Canadian Club, and of Mr. Esterbrook to the Canadian Bar Association— have helped to make us more tolerant of American neutrality. We were getting a little tired of the type of orator who came up from the United States into Canada—like Mr. Bourke Cockran and Mr. John R. Mott—for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of saying nothing that would prejudice any influence their countrymen might be able to bring to bear on the settlement of the terms of peace. To tell the truth, we have not quite made up our minds that we shall need the United States for the purposes of that settlement. Sir Edward Grey put the thing in a nutshell the other day when he said that if the neutral nations cannot help us to drive the Germans out of Belgium, the best thing they could do would be to stay quiet while we are doing the work. We are most grateful for American support, and warmly appreciate the fact that, in spite of official neutrality at Washington, the great heart of the people is beating in sympathy with ours. There are thousands even of German-Americans who would cordially endorse the terms of the message sent from Berlin, Ontario, where the Canadians of German birth or origin, in forwarding a handsome subscription to the Patriotic Fund, took the opportunity of stating that they "want to see militarism in Germany smashed for good and the people free to shape a greater and a better Germany." But in spite of this most welcome attitude on the part of individuals, so many of whom cherish what may be called, in deference to Washington, a "boiling neutrality," we do not quite see that the United States, by staying out of the war, has made itself, as President Murray Butler thinks, the