

arms is nothing new. Revolutionary and Imperial France was a nation in arms. The Germany of 1814 was a nation in arms; and if ever there was a nation in arms at all, it was the Spain of 1808. Yet that was the very era in which the principle laid down by Franklin and Rousseau was adopted, that war is a struggle between armed forces, which ought not to involve civilians.

The British attempt to intercept provisions destined for France in 1793, on the ground that France could only be brought to terms by creating distress among its civil population, was resisted not only by America, but by Denmark. Under Jay's Treaty of 1794, Great Britain paid damages for the seizures of American goods made in the prosecution of the attempt. Woolsey's remark has always seemed sensible, that a nation which arms the bulk of its population—as the British asserted France had done—would be reduced to famine by the operation of the laws of political economy, without the need for any special interference on the part of its enemy. In fact, the *quasi* siege warfare of modern days must result in the strain on civil supply being too great. The swollen armies in the trenches must sooner or later be depleted for the service of the factories and the fields. And in such a prolonged contest, that nation will be likely to succeed which has the most perfect and reliable civil basis at home for its operations at the front. When this is recognized, it will be difficult to maintain the immunities of civilians in their entirety.—*Law Magazine*.

RIGHTS OF MINORITIES OF SHAREHOLDERS IN COMPANIES.

When an indignant shareholder in a company finds himself in disagreement with the majority of his fellow shareholders at a general meeting, and asks what remedy he has, the answer is that the court will not interfere with the internal management of the affairs of a company, and that for any wrong done to the company it is the company which must sue and not the individual member of the company.