

founded in self-government laid down at Confederation are maintained or not.

Ignoring these principles, each party magnifies its own method, and their methods are both on a false foundation, if Macdonald, Brown and Cartier were right.

In another work ["Canada and Sea Power"] the writer has discussed the question of war and the modern movements making for international co-operation, and has endeavored to show the unique opportunity Canada, of all nations, has in leading in this movement towards international good will. If Canada is now to be carried away by the fallacy of "sea power" she will be self-disqualified from taking this lead and her grand opportunity will be lost.

The illusory notion which it suits the big-gun firms, the warship firms and other armament firms so well to perpetuate is that it is necessary for Great Britain to be supreme on the ocean. It can be demonstrated that in the sense in which it is meant to be understood it is now impossible for any one power or even a group of powers to dominate the ocean, to the extent of destroying or even suspending the peaceful commerce of the world, for the reason that too much of the world is now civilized and in absolute need of maintaining peaceful trade and the whole earth would cry out against such an outrage. A hundred years ago the marine trade of the world practically centred on England, now scores of nations have direct commerce with each other which does not pass through British ports at all, and this new distribution is increasing every year. The fact is that the only part of the seven seas which Great Britain can effectively "dominate" are the home waters immediately surrounding the British Isles. Great Britain is no longer supreme, even in the Mediterranean—as Admiral Mahan, the father of the "sea power" fallacy—himself admitted the other day in a letter to a London paper.

If Great Britain agreed to the immunity of peaceful private shipping in war time—in conforming with the universally recognized rule on land—then the safety of Canadian, Australian, South African and all other commerce at sea would be assured under international law; but at the last Hague conference the British Government declined to agree to a proposal to which two-thirds of the nations represented were favorable. Among these was Germany, and when we remember that two-thirds of all Germany's foreign trade is sea-borne can one wonder that that nation felt justified in safeguarding her coasts by the same means which have been pleaded for the "supremacy" of the British navy? The moment Great Britain agrees to exempt peaceful ships from seizure that decree will automatically free Canadian ships of commerce from danger, and