

The Toronto World

FOUNDED 1880.
A Morning Newspaper Published Every Day in the Year by The World Newspaper Company of Toronto Limited, 11, J. Maclean, Managing Director.
WORLD BUILDING, TORONTO.
NO. 40 WEST RICHMOND STREET.
Telephone Calls:
MAIN 5308—Private Exchange connecting all departments.
\$3.00
Will pay for The Daily World for one year, delivered in the City of Toronto, or by mail to any address in Canada, Great Britain or the United States.
\$2.00
Will pay for The Sunday World for one year, delivered in the City of Toronto, or by mail to any address in Canada, Great Britain or the United States.
\$2.00
Subscribers are requested to advise us promptly of any irregularity or delay in delivery of The World.

MONDAY MORNING, MARCH 3, 1913

TAX REFORM AND THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

Mr. R. Home Smith has been re-elected president of the Associated Boards of Trade at London. He flatly declared it to be a political issue. And apparently a number of gentlemen swallowed their economic convictions, and brought down the vote to a narrow majority for tax reform. Even this cannot be entirely satisfactory to Sir James Whitney. With the notification that the question was a party issue still the vote was in favor of tax reform. And if it had not been a party issue we may be sure it would have been very much more largely in favor of tax reform. It is well to note, however, that an intelligent body, such as the convention of the Associated Boards of Trade, tax reform had an independent majority. It is not to be doubted that this represents the opinion of the country. The whole question is then, to what extent are the people willing to forego tax reform for the sake of other benefits to be expected from Sir James Whitney's government; or how long will it be before they develop sufficient confidence in Mr. Rowell and his followers for the sake of tax reform to trust them with the management of the hydro-electric system, which Liberals oppose in Hamilton, in Brantford, in Newmarket and Aurora, and in fact wherever they have the opportunity? Mr. Rowell has to set his party right on this question. No doubt Sir James has calculated the odds before he declared against tax reform.

Mr. Home Smith naturally opposes tax reform. The more vacant areas anyone has under his control the less favorably he is impressed with a proposal to make the land bear the burden of taxation. The farmer does not object, for his land is under cultivation and making its due returns. The builder does not object, for the prospective buyer or the tenant bears the load. But the speculator waiting for the unearned increment, or the earned increment, for that matter, prefers to treat tax reform as an impracticable theory. Mr. Home Smith should have the credit of proposing a sliding scale exemption for workman's homes, and a tax to be readjusted at intervals, on the unearned increment on land, following the Lloyd George system.

Perhaps Sir James will take note of Mr. Home Smith's two suggestions, along with the demand for reform made by the Associated Boards which Mr. Home Smith, on political grounds, opposed.

ENTRANCE OF RADIALS.
For some years the question of the right of the radial railway lines to use the city lines has been under discussion. The peculiarity of the situation lay in the fact that with virtual common ownership, the city company refused to allow its allied companies any running rights on terms that the city could agree to. The situation is changing as the term of the company's franchise approaches expiry. The radial lines must have entrance to the city, when the city itself owns the street railway system. It will be easier perhaps to make terms now than afterwards.

Corporation Counsel Geary, according to The News, has been giving a great deal of attention to this matter for some time past, and proposes an amendment to the Railway Act, based on that brought forward by Mr. W. K. McNamara, M.L.A., which provided that where two or more electric street railway systems, owned or operated by different corporations, be contiguous to one another, it shall be their duty to afford each other reasonable facilities for the interchange of traffic, the railway board to be the arbiter where there is disagreement. Mr. Geary's clause reads:

"The board may, on the application of one of the corporations owning or operating the street railway systems lying contiguous to one another, or on the application of any other corporation, order that each of either of the said street railway systems should be operated over the other street railway systems so lying contiguous thereto."

There can be no objection to the apparent intention in this, but the board of control must be careful to consider all that may not be apparent, and yet may be forcibly present as in some of the legislation that has gone to the privy council. If the city is to become the owner of the street railway system, and finds that its ownership is subject to a clause which makes it possible that "each of either of the said street railway systems should be operated

over the other street railway system," the octopus corporation might be able to do as it pleased about running its cars over city lines, if it found a chairman as complacent as Chairman Leitch was about double-tracking Yonge street. A judge might argue very reasonably from this clause, that the contiguous Metropolitan or Suburban or other railway, "should be operated over" the city lines for the convenience and benefit of the public, and that it was so expressly stated in the act. Is this the intention? Is the city to have no control over its own lines, such as the company has at present?

There ought to be proper safeguards to preserve the city's rights, nor should it be lost sight of that the proper entrance for the radial lines is over a tube railway. We doubt very much whether running rights and transfer of traffic should be elaborated into the power to "operate" over the city lines. This might benefit the city, but we venture to think it would benefit the corporations tenfold.

GET AN EASTERN ENTRANCE

Mr. J. G. Kent has been re-elected president of the Canadian National Exhibition Association, and the success of last year's "Fair" entirely justifies the confidence carried in the compliment. If Mr. Kent can secure an eastern entrance to the Exhibition grounds this year, it will signalize his presidency as almost nothing else could. The record of attendance has reached its limit with the present means of transportation. People will not always undertake to face the discomfort and positive risks of the mighty struggle for cars, and until visitors can be assured of reasonable relief from the sortsmage at the cars, after the fireworks, the attendance is not likely largely to increase.

ANGLO-GERMAN INTERESTS.

Perusal of the official reports of the speeches made by Herr von Jagow in the reichstag, and by Admiral von Tirpitz in the budget committee, regarding the relations between the United Kingdom and the German Empire, adds to the satisfaction caused by the first published summaries. The former took the opportunity to identify himself with the declaration made by his predecessor to the effect that during the Balkan crisis these relations had been particularly confidential. Herr von Jagow added that the expectation that these services would continue to be performed, had been completely fulfilled and the German Government has now perceived that it has not only got points of contact of a sentimental kind with England, but also that identical interests are present.

Admiral von Tirpitz in repudiating with some apparent warmth the reproach that his previous remarks showed aversion from England, said that he would be the first to greet understanding with joy. He then expressed the opinion that Mr. Winston Churchill's proportion of 1.6 to 1 in battleships would be acceptable and that this showed no intention on the part of Germany to step into rivalry with England. Both speakers deprecated hasty action in the way of endeavoring to reach a distinct agreement on the subject of naval armaments, but the whole tendency of their observations was to bring into relief the gradual removal of the misunderstandings that have created so much distrust and suspicion in the two countries. Nor need the considerable additions being made to the military strength of Germany and France be regarded as presaging a nearer war. Moves and counter moves of this kind are always occurring and by themselves convey no new element of danger.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PRESIDENT

Tomorrow Mr. Woodrow Wilson will be formally inaugurated and enter upon his term of office as twenty-eighth president of the United States. His cabinet will then be made public, and notwithstanding the various forecasts that have been made, its composition remains matter of conjecture only. That Mr. William J. Bryan will be found in the chair of secretary of state seems, however, to be generally anticipated and the prospect is not welcomed by the conservative section of the Democratic party, to whom the "peace" one remains anathema. The new president, however, is nothing but courageous, and unless all indications are belied he intends to be master of his presidential staff whoever may be of his advisers. But he needs an interpreter to the people, and in that capacity Mr. Bryan can be of infinite service. For he has the ear of the people of the United States, and they are today soundly progressive in temper.

This view receives support from a declaration of his faith made by Mr. Wilson years ago when he was fighting his second battle at Princeton University. As quoted in an interesting article on "The President," which occupies the place of honor in the current number of The Atlantic Monthly, he then said:

"The great voice of America does not come from the seats of learning. It comes in a murmur from the hills and woods and farms and factories and the mills, rolling and gaining volume until it comes to us from the homes of common men. Do these murmurs echo in the corridors of the universities? I have not heard them. The universities would make men forget their common origins, forget their universal sympathies and join a class and no class can ever serve America. I have dedicated every power there is within me to bring



All Real Men Drink **Kee's** SPECIAL EXTRA MILD STOUT

IT'S a fine, old, mellow stout—that is as rich and nourishing, as fresh cream—yet won't make you bilious because it's extra mild.

ORDER A CASE FROM YOUR DEALER.

BRITAIN RENEWS ARBITRATION DEMAND

Continued From Page 1.

contained in your despatch of the seventeenth ultimo to the United States charge d'affaires at London regarding the difference of opinion that has arisen between our two governments as to the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, but they desire me in the meantime to offer the following observations with regard to the argument that no case has yet arisen calling for any submission to arbitration of the points in difference between His Majesty's Government and that of the United States on the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, because no actual injury has as yet resulted to any British interest and all that has been done so far has been to pass an act of congress under which action held by His Majesty's government to be prejudicial to British interest might be taken.

"PANKHURST PATER."
The Orilla Packet asks who or where is Pankhurst Pater? The answer to that is the whole story of the suffrage movement. Pankhurst Pater died many and many a year ago, when Sylvia and her sister were little girls, and Pankhurst Pater had to go out and hustle for a living for them. She knows by experience the disabilities that attend and the difficulties that beset a widow with children, but with no vote to help remedy the laws that are made by prosperous people for prosperous people of the male sex.

West Middlesex is the last district to apply for hydro-electric power. A convention held at Mount Brydges on Feb. 28 endorsed the hydro-radial railway proposals, and asked for 750 horse-power for distribution among the farmers of the district.

The Philosopher of Folly

By Sherwood Hart

MILITANTICS.

From Britain's shores come shouts and roars from village, town and city; the men they've sent to parliament have our sincerest pity. All bent and gray they go their way and daily grow forlorn; they can't forget a guffaw, yet may lurk around the corner. In twos and threes, with trembling knees, they hurry to their duty; they madly race to reach their place, pursued by youth and beauty. It seems to vex the gentler sex to see them run for shelter; it hurts them to see them slide for safety, helter-skelter. It is, I ween, a curious case which Mr. K's oft take part in—to see them rush thru crowd and crush, and then to see them dart in thru guarded doors amid the roars of militant laughter, while female chieftains burst on their ears, and jar each ancient rafter. Oh, ne'er, I wot, could be forgot the views which meet our vision as members pass the gates of brass pursued by wild derision. Just see Lloyd George like lightning forge ahead and pass the portals while a hie head come chunks of lead and bricks, and jeers and choruses. See Churchill fool topper, school intent to smash his right into the right in headlong flight, see Asquith come a cropper! As they debate affairs of state, the bravest patriot trembles when women's cheers burst on his ears—he knows the foe assemblies! Oh, not for me to lose my life in frantic strife with some misguided spinster.

It Builds Up The System

It is not only disagreeable, but positively alarming to be getting thinner and weaker from day to day. This indicates that the digestive system is failing to supply the nourishment required to maintain health and strength.

You must resort to other means of restoring strength, and in this connection there is nothing like Dr. Chase's Nerve Food to form new, rich blood, revitalize the wasted nerves and restore to the digestive system its natural functions.

Mr. Fred Carstens, farmer, Laird, Sask., writes: "I was very thin and nervous, and as I was continually growing weaker, I decided to try Dr. Chase's Nerve Food. I would suffer from headaches and indigestion, was easily worried and excited and felt generally run down. The benefit obtained from this food cure has been very marked, and I recommend it to the greatest confidence to persons who are thin, weak and nervous."

At Osgoode Hall

March 1, 1913

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Motions set down for single court for Monday, March 3, at 11 a.m.:
1. Phillips v. Phillips.
2. Uptegraft v. Stein.
3. Casselman v. Moore.

Peremptory list for appellate division for Monday, March 3, at 11 a.m.:
1. Holden v. Ryan (to be continued).
2. Ramsey v. Toronto Railway Co.
3. Morrison v. Pere Marquette Railroad Co.
4. Sphinx Manufacturing Co. v. Reesor.
5. Strong v. London Machine Co.
6. Piper v. Stevenson.

Master's Chambers.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Morgan v. J. J. Elliott for defendants.
Land Co.—W. J. Elliott for defendants.
G. Waldron for plaintiff. Motion by defendants for order striking out certain paragraphs of statement of claim and for further and better particulars of the same. Judgment: There will be an order similar to that made in Murray case, so far as applicable, on Feb. 28. Defendants to have ten days from delivery of particulars to plead. Costs of motion to defendants in case.

Murray v. Thames Valley Garden Land Co.—W. J. Elliott for defendants.
N. F. Davidson, K.C., for plaintiff. Motion by defendants to strike out certain paragraphs of statement of claim as embarrassing to strike out paragraph one of particulars and for proper particulars to be delivered in respect of this, etc. Judgment: It seems almost self-evident that defendants have all they require to enable them to plead. Justice will be done by directing the statements of defence to be delivered in ten days from this date, the plaintiff to be confined to the particulars now delivered unless further or other particulars are delivered not less than three weeks before the trial. The defendants will be able to amend if they wish to rely on it at present. Costs of this motion will be to plaintiff in the cause.

Union Bank v. Toronto Pressed Steel Co.—J. H. Spence for defendants.
J. C. Cassels, K.C., for plaintiffs. Motion by defendants to set aside default judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment.

Bank of Ottawa v. Stewart—Shaw (Hastings) for plaintiff. Judgment: It is a fault judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment.

Jackman v. Worth—F. Aylesworth, for defendant, moved for order str. K. McKay, K.C., for plaintiff. Reserved.

Brown v. Timmins—J. G. Smith, for defendant, moved for order set aside amended statement of claim. K. McKay, K.C., for plaintiff. Reserved.

Scully v. Madigan—C. F. Ritchie, for defendant, judgment creditor, moved for attaching order. J. P. Black, for plaintiff. Judgment: The defendant is ordered to pay the sum of \$100 to the plaintiff, with costs.

Judges' Chambers.
Before Middleton, J.
Re Grace Cameron—W. A. Henderson for father. H. S. White for aunt of infant. Motion by Charles Cameron, father, on return of habeas corpus for an order for possession of infant daughter. Judgment: "The case has given me much anxiety, as I realize the extent of the father's right to the custody of his children and the responsibility of depriving him of the duty and privilege incident to this right, and I have also present to my mind the disadvantage of separating two children, yet the facts of the case which I refrain from setting forth at greater length convince me that the welfare of the little girl requires that she should be left in the custody of her aunt, who has stood in the place of her mother almost from the day of her birth, rather than in the custody of the father, who will have to be away from home during most of her waking hours, and must undertake to take care of her and training and to provide for her maintenance, and I do not think costs should be awarded."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

To sit with Wifie by the fireside on a winter's night,
With a good pipe and matches, is my great delight,
Because I know the matches, Eddy's Silents, are alright.
They're Safe, Sure, Silent—each time I strike I get a light.

The E. B. EDDY CO., Limited

HULL, CANADA

Established 1856

P. BURNS & CO.

Wholesale and Retail

COAL and WOOD

Head Office, 49 King E. Telephone Main 131 and 132

Office and Yard—Front and Bathurst Sts., Tel. Adel. 1968, 1996.

"Princess and Esplanade, Tel. Main 190.

Dupont and Huron Sts., Tel. Hillcrest 1825.

Logan Avenue, Tel. North 1601.

Morrow Avenue, Tel. Junction 3786.

Office—572 Queen W., Coll. 12.

1312 Queen W., Tel. Park 711.

304 Queen E., Tel. Main 134.

Fresh Mined Anthracite Coal Arriving Daily

GLENERNAN

Scotch Whisky

A blend of pure Highland malts, bottled in Scotland, exclusively for

MICHIE & CO., Ltd.

TORONTO

Action by Edna Isabella Fairweather, widow of Henry Ivon Fairweather, to recover \$10,000 damages for the death by drowning of her husband, taken in charge of the Nassau power house of defendants, while cutting away the ice and debris on and over the apron of the sluiceway alleged to have been carelessly by the defendants and judgment of defendants. Judgment: The plaintiff is entitled to recover the sum of \$10,000, with costs.

Robinson v. Matthews—E. W. Boyd, for plaintiff, moved for order of judgment dismissing action without costs and vacating his pendens.

Bank of Ottawa v. Stewart—Shaw (Hastings) for plaintiff. Judgment: It is a fault judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment. Judgment: It is a fault judgment.

Jackman v. Worth—F. Aylesworth, for defendant, moved for order str. K. McKay, K.C., for plaintiff. Reserved.

Brown v. Timmins—J. G. Smith, for defendant, moved for order set aside amended statement of claim. K. McKay, K.C., for plaintiff. Reserved.

Scully v. Madigan—C. F. Ritchie, for defendant, judgment creditor, moved for attaching order. J. P. Black, for plaintiff. Judgment: The defendant is ordered to pay the sum of \$100 to the plaintiff, with costs.

Judges' Chambers.
Before Middleton, J.
Re Grace Cameron—W. A. Henderson for father. H. S. White for aunt of infant. Motion by Charles Cameron, father, on return of habeas corpus for an order for possession of infant daughter. Judgment: "The case has given me much anxiety, as I realize the extent of the father's right to the custody of his children and the responsibility of depriving him of the duty and privilege incident to this right, and I have also present to my mind the disadvantage of separating two children, yet the facts of the case which I refrain from setting forth at greater length convince me that the welfare of the little girl requires that she should be left in the custody of her aunt, who has stood in the place of her mother almost from the day of her birth, rather than in the custody of the father, who will have to be away from home during most of her waking hours, and must undertake to take care of her and training and to provide for her maintenance, and I do not think costs should be awarded."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which, better, also, that when vessels begin to pass thru the great waterway, in whose construction the world has been interested, there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the U. S. will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility."

Before Hodgins, J.
Fairweather v. Canadian General Electric Co.—G. G. Porter, K.C., for plaintiff. G. H. Watson, K.C., and L. M. Hayes, K.C., for defendants.

The suggestion contained in the last paragraph of your note under reply, his majesty's government conceive that article 1 of the treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that there is no need of it being sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may and the most convenient that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States to remove the objection entertained by his majesty's government to the act.

Case for Arbitration.
"His majesty's government have not desired me to argue in this note that their interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the correct view, but only that a case for arbitration of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the canal, and by means which will leave no ground for complaint or complaint of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the U. S. has been for so long a foremost and constant advocate. His majesty's government think it more in accordance with the general principle of arbitration that the settlement desired should precede, rather than follow, the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage, and which,