

eliminating, insofar as we can, the possible causes of war. I think the best thing to do is to come to some unanimous judgment as to what you want to accomplish and the title will take care of itself. When your object is decided upon the name comes naturally. If you use peaches in a pie or quinces or apples, you call it a peach pie or an apple pie, and there is no trouble about it. The purpose of the conference should be centered around this one main purpose—to arrive at some arrangement by treaty, or by such other means as will be judged best fitted, by the governments, to eliminate the causes of war. There never has been a big war in the Pacific, and we want to eliminate all possible causes for a war in the future. The one chance for war in the Pacific is racial pride. People don't go to war over commercial things, over armaments, or tariffs, but because of racial pride.

"You can do almost as you wish so long as you pay respect to the racial pride of each of the different governments, but as soon as you say in an impolite tone, 'this is our business, this is our law, and we don't care if you like it or not,' then friction is bound to follow, and as soon as the other fellow is strong enough, or feels himself strong enough and has the crowd behind him, then some irresponsible fellow with a bomb or knife attacks some prominent person, and there is the pretext for war."

Discussing the objects of the Pan-Pacific Legal Conference Colonel Brown said: "A year ago at the Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Conference there was a legal committee which met separately, and the results of their meetings were reported to the general conference and the arrangement worked very well. The members of the larger conference, if this plan were followed again, have the advice and assistance of those specially trained in law. I think that

would be a good idea to follow, but I am not making an arbitrary suggestion. What we need is a substantial similarity in the body of the law on certain particular subjects in the different countries, and those subjects are the ones that the Nationalists of the different countries are always coming in contact with each other on—trade and commerce, maritime law, bills and notes, and weights and measures. The unification of those is important. However, those who would take the initiative in the unification of such laws are not lawyers. We should have prominent bankers and financiers for the laws on bills and notes, and so on."

Prof. K. Takayanagi urged that such matters be taken up as legal assistance to the poor, contingent fees, etc. "Those are educative," he said, "and I thought that was the scope and purpose of the Conference. The legal systems differ in different countries, but there are common points, and if the lawyers gather and discuss those common questions and explain to each other their viewpoints, the interchange of opinions will be helpful in solving the problems of the individual countries. The main object of course is educational, and we do not need to come to any definite resolutions. That was the method of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and while there were no resolutions, much benefit was gained by all members. I think the conference of the lawyers would be beneficial."

Colonel Brown stated that the purposes of the Pan-Pacific Legal Conference should be threefold: to interchange information as to local problems of courts and lawyers; to lead toward uniformity of laws in which the various countries may agree; and to assist the Conference on International Cooperation.

The following resolution, moved by Colonel Brown and seconded by Professor Takayanagi, passed: