

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XL.

DECEMBER 1, 1904.

NO. 23.

All good and true men who speak the English tongue will rejoice at the news that a treaty of arbitration is again being formulated between Great Britain and the United States. Let us hope that this time the federal senate will forget its obduracy, born of international narrow-mindedness, and advance the outposts of civilization many a league toward the millennium by ratifying the treaty. We are quite sensible of the fact that a treaty of arbitration does not mean an alliance between the two powers signatory; but who shall say that it does not make for that desideratum to a prodigious degree? On Christmas eve, 1874, the late Joseph Cook, speaking in Tremont Temple, said: "In the possible, I do not say in the probable, future, there lies at a distance of not more than three centuries, an alliance, not a union, of Great Britain, United States, Australia, India, belting the globe and possessed of power to strike a universal peace through half the continents and all the seas." If he had spoken in the altered condition of things to-day between the two great bodies of the Anglo-Saxon race, British and American, he might have reduced the period of the consummation of his prophecy to fifty years.

Apropos of the above, we are forced to say, with regret, that "international narrow-mindedness" does not find its sole exponent in the United States Senate. There are certain English publicists writing in the reviews and other great organs of thought in Europe who seem to be determinedly doing their worst to retard the progress of arbitration. Take an instance at random. In the "Empire Review" for October last, Mr. Edward Dicey, C.B., rudely speaks of International Law as being a "delusion" so far as it possesses any binding authority. (We might ask him, parenthetically, if "public opinion" is not the ultimate sanction of International Law as it is of any code of municipal or civil law?) Then he says: "The whole theory that war might be avoided by arbitration seems to me to be based upon a fundamental misconception of human nature." (Again, parenthetically, we might observe that Aristotle's clanless outlaw might have enunciated a similar opinion about the judicial arbitrament of disputes between