



by our great and good President Taft, which was so unfortunately emasculated by our Senate, Germany has never signed any such treaty with us, although given the opportunity to do so.

All this is most natural. Great Britain and the United States have all the territory they need or desire; if anything, they each have a wee bit more than is good for them. Why should such nations not be ready to arbitrate or to submit their differences to a tribunal which must decide their cause upon principles which safeguard property rights? It is the man who has not and not the man who has who wonders whether courts are all they are cracked up to be. An International Super-Supreme Court must necessarily be guided by principles of law and jurisprudence and must respect established rights. It cannot safely become a mere dictator or a modern Caliph, dispensing justice upon no other basis than its own conceptions of what may be good for mankind. War is terrible, but more horrible still would be a world governed by an autocratic committee with absolute powers unrestrained by any settled body of law and precedent; a Czar of Czars as Czars existed centuries ago. We see, then, why Great Britain, France, Russia and the United States, all of them nations with an abundance of land, may be expected to cheerfully acquiesce in submitting their claims as to boundaries to an International Court as against

LORD MILNER, member of the War Council of Five, is a man of Imperializing deeds. He is a doer first, a thinker afterwards. Lord Curzon, President of the Council, is a man of action. He administrated India. Since the war began he has been on the shelf. He is now free—to act. Rt. Hon. Arthur Balfour, unfitted for the Admiralty, in his new position as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, will translate his vast world knowledge into action. Lord Devonport as Third Controller was once errand boy in a tea house, made a fortune in the grocery trade, and won public fame as a man of action by his remarkable administration of the Port of London. The Earl of Derby, the new War Secretary, is already famous as a shirt-sleeves organizer.

Germany and why Germany, which wants more land, looks with no favour upon such a tribunal. Bismarck may have been in error when he decided against colonies for the Fatherland, although it might be well to wait another fifty years before reaching a conclusion on this point, but Germany, which owes her all to his genius, must accept, in the bargain, the results of his minor mistakes, if such they be.

It may, therefore, be properly urged that if Germany should not be ready to put her claims, whatever they may be, before an impartial court, then the other nations should join hands and compel her so to do. But from one and a very fundamental point of view this is precisely what the Allies are attempting to do to-day. Great Britain has repeatedly and truthfully declared that she is fighting for the inviolability of treaties and for the rights of small nations to live their lives in their own way, and these are the root causes which Great Britain started out to defend. The fact that this paramount issue has since been somewhat clouded by the German inhumanities and atrocities only strengthens the correctness of the original position.

It is clear nonsense to talk about International Courts in a world in which treaties themselves have recently been considered as scraps of paper by one great nation now at war, with no present sign of a

(Concluded on page 18.)