

# The Barrister.

VOL. III.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1897.

No. 2

## EDITORIAL.

### Arbitration.

Ontario legislation is very apt to follow that of England in matters pertaining to the administration of justice. In addition, many of our fads and fancies are fashioned after English precedent. This is rather to be expected. Usually the result of following this lead is advantageous to us. It is apparently just as well at times to let the other fellows' boat break the ice; or, as Cardinal Wolsey charged his faithful Secretary, Cromwell—"Say that Wolsey—that once trod the ways of glory, and sounded all the depths and shoals of honour—found thee a way, out of his wreck, to rise in; a safe and sure one, though thy master missed it. Mark but my fall, and that that ruined me."

The sudden rise and just as rapid collapse of a certain department of arbitration among "the men of London" ought to prove a profitable object lesson to our On-

tario legislators. We have had the pleasure of perusing a very practical and vivacious paper, written by Mr. C. H. Pickstone, a Solicitor of Radcliffe Bridge, England, published in the *American Law Review* for January-February, entitled, "The Fallacy of Compromise and Arbitration." This article was reprinted by our American contemporary from the London, England, *Law Times*. The learned author, in a most readable article, decapitates the already defunct "Infant English Chamber of Commerce." When all England, particularly London, was arbitration-mad in 1891, the late Chief Justice Coleridge hazarded this significant suggestion:—"It may be—I do not say it is so—that the men of London may prefer to have their causes settled quickly and inexpensively by some sensible and honourable man, who knows the nature of the business and may be trusted, to the enormous expenditure and endless delay which