declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." Though sound as a political doctrine, and wise in the circumstances which gave rise to its enunciation, it is too vague to be applied as a rule of international law, and even as a political formula requires careful limitation to circumstances and purposes similar to those of its origin; while in result, as truly said by a writer ten years ago, it has been its fate to be "perverted at home and misunderstood abroad." To quote the same writer ("Essays on Modern International Law," by J. T. Lawrence): "Just as American interference in European affairs is permissible when American interests are clearly involved, so is European interference in American affairs justifiable if definite and unmistakable European interests are concerned. The Monroe doctrine objected to the trajection of European State systems across the Atlantic, but it did not declare for the closure of the American hemisphere to European diplomacy." The United States have on several occasions interfered in the settlement of matters within the Eastern hemisphere. *e.g.*, the surrender of Denmark of the Sound dues, the Egyptian Law of Liquidation in 1884, and the West African Conference at Berlin in 1885; but the present is not the first notable occasion upon which they have attempted to extend and misapply the Monroe doctrine On the question of the Panama canal the United States contended that it should be under American control, and refused to surrender this control to any European power or combination of European powers. When in 1889 there was some possibility of the French Government getting control, the United States Senate resolved that the government of the United States would look with serious concern and disapproval upon any connection of any European government with construction of the canal, and must regard any such connection or control as injurious to the just rights and interests of the United States, and a menace to their welfare. Just as Mr. Blaine attempted in 1889 to wrest the doctrine beyond its proper scope, so now Mr. Olney and President Cleveland are trying to "go one better," by claiming that in a boundary dispute between Great Britain and an independant American republic, the United States shall determine the mode in which the dispute shall be tried.

We may note the following limitations to the doctrine in its relation to Great Britain and the present dispute as to Venezuela. (1) It is a mere doctrine of political formula and not a rule of international law. We have Calvo's authority for this, and even Wharton admits it. (2) Great Britain is itself an American power. What of Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Honduras, or British Guinea? (3) The doctrine was directed against the introduction of European "political systems" into America. Neither the making or control of a canal, nor the method of settling a boundary dispute with another American State, is the introduction of a "European political system."—*The Law Times* (*England.*)