

satisfied that the infant English Tribunal of Commerce is growing in stature and in favour both with the public and with the legal profession. "There has been a sufficient number of cases," he says, "to test the organization of the chamber, and those disputants who have had recourse to it speak well of the simplicity, the rapidity, and the efficiency of its machinery." Again, although the High Court has as yet referred only a single question to its arbitrament, "the expedition with which this case (involving much technical knowledge) was heard and decided elicited expressions of satisfaction from the court"; and, doubtless, "this will lead to the court sending down similar cases involving technical or special knowledge." The "legal technicality" that invalidated or retarded the operative effect of an award was, of course, a regrettable incident, but "the arrangements of the chamber are designed to prevent such occurrences." Again, "a rush of cases" to the Guildhall was not expected, "because the majority of existing contracts specify some other form of arbitration"; but the chairman is informed that solicitors, public companies, and others are now employing a clause in agreements referring disputes to the chamber. On these grounds, and in virtue of the economy, the rapidity, and the efficiency with which the chamber has exercised its "prentice hand" where it has had the opportunity of doing so, the chairman of the Joint Committee contends that the usefulness of the chamber has been established, and that it has accomplished what was promised, viz., the speedy, satisfactory, and inexpensive settlement of disputes. We have only a few observations to offer on this remarkable letter. It is the latest, and, in our opinion, the worst example of the tendency which public and quasi-public departments are displaying to convert what ought to be a report into an *apologia*. The same mischievous phenomenon has recently manifested itself in the Return made by the Director of Public Prosecutions, and, to some extent, by the Inspector-General in Companies' Liquidation. But Sir A. K. Stevenson and Mr. John Smith are merely controversial. The chairman of the Joint Committee is not only controversial, but vague. It would have been better to let the Chamber of Arbitration go on working "silently" and "unobtrusively" till definite statistics as to its success or failure could be furnished to the public. That arbitration will play an important part in the future as it has played in