

selves "Civis Romanus Sum." In the words of the city motto, he would say to all 'Concordia Salus.'

The toast was also responded to by the Hon. Mr. Marchand, the leader of the Opposition. Addresses followed by acting Chief Justice Tait, the Hon. Mr. Robidoux, Q.C., and Mr. Donald Macmaster, Q.C., in reply to "The Bench and the Bar," which had been proposed by Mr. George Hague. The other toasts on the list were "The Militia of Canada" and "The City of Montreal," which elicited speeches from the Hon. T. Chapais, the Hon. Mr. Justice Davidson, Quarter Master Lake, Alderman Rainville and Alderman McBride. His Excellency then in a few graceful and pleasant words proposed "The Mayor of Montreal," who briefly responded.

As the company retired the conviction was generally expressed, that they had been present at a banquet respecting which the hope was universally entertained that it would inaugurate a series to be given by the successive Mayors of Montreal—the commercial Metropolis of Canada—as social gatherings of representative authorities in the State, and of different classes of citizens, would give distinction to the city, and serve the general interests of the Dominion.

#### THE ARBITRATION TREATY.

THE CHRONICLE over a year ago expressed a hope that ere long a movement would become general amongst the nations looking towards a system being established for national disputes being settled as are those between individuals, or corporate bodies. All such differences are settled in Courts of law or equity, or are referred to arbitrators, by whose decision the respective parties must abide. If any two citizens in these days attempt to settle a difference by brute force, they are not only disgraced in the eyes of the community, but bring themselves within the pale of the criminal law. It is not a generation ago since what was called "honor" demanded certain quarrels to be settled by each disputant trying to kill or maim his opponent. Such an idea of honor is now condemned as a scandal to civilization; duelling is now not dishonorable merely, but criminal. This revolution in sentiment is like the first streaks of light presaging the dawn of the day when this judgment as to the shame of resorting to physical force in order to settle private disputes will be so developed as to include those quarrels which arise between nations.

It would be an easy matter to show how utterly wasted were the expenditures on most of the wars which stained every European country with blood in by-gone centuries since Caesar over-ran a large part of that continent, and England to bring its peoples into subjection to Rome. Out of the folly, and even brutalities of men, Providence has evolved conditions by which the wisdom and the elevation of our race have been

enhanced. But folly and brutality are not atoned for by, or justified because out of their evils good has been educed by the over-ruling of Providence. We therefore record with eminent satisfaction the conclusion of a Treaty whereby Great Britain and the United States are severally bound to refer all their disputes to a Board of Arbitration. The members of it are to be three members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and three Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, with arrangement for extending, or changing the personnel of the Board in case of the first named members failing to agree. The supreme value of this Treaty is the formal recognition by the two most powerful nations in the world of the wisdom of referring all matters in dispute between them to arbitration. The Treaty in fact embodies the idea we expressed some time ago, that an inter-national tribunal should be established to act in regard to national disputes as a Court of law acts in dealing with private ones. The Board of Arbitration will have no power analogous to that of a Court to enforce its judgments. This we may at once admit to be a drawback. But in case either of the contracting powers decides to ignore the decision of the Board which it helped to create, and whereon it is represented, such nation will find itself discredited amongst other nations by disregarding Treaty obligations into which it voluntarily and solemnly entered. The new Treaty is not only different in scope to any previous one, but differs also widely in the circumstances to which it owes its origin. By Treaties, one nation, Poland, was obliterated from the map of Europe. By a Treaty this Canada of ours was deprived of territory to which she was justly entitled, to her everlasting injury. Treaties have often been an agreement for the division of the spoil which both parties had sought to seize for its own enrichment. Treaties have often been the outcome of war, or a condition of an ally's service in war. The Anglo-American Treaty is wholly free from such a stain. It is the voluntary acceptance by two great powers of the lofty principle, that disputes between two such nations as Great Britain and the United States ought to be settled in a manner becoming their occupancy of the van of civilization.

In the Queen's speech the Treaty is commended to other nations as an example for their consideration. Lord Salisbury, in alluding to it in the House of Lords, spoke of there being a growing tendency to substitute judicial decision for "the coarse arbitrament of war"—a very happy and highly significant phrase to be used by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Long years will elapse before the glory and glamor of war are regarded as "coarse," but the new Treaty will mark the first formal step towards a higher plane of civilization whereon international displays of brute force will be suppressed, as they now are between individuals. Canada has especial cause for gratification over such a Treaty being effected as it will prevent a repetition of those spasms of alarm which have always disturbed this country, much to the injury of its trade, when the relations between Great Britain and the United States became unfriendly.