decision. In 1918 the Supreme Court went so far as to declare, in the abstract, that the Federal government had the right to enforce upon a state compliance with decrees of the Federal judiciary. But the ruling was left in the abstract. The ways and means of execution were not defined. In 1919 West Virginia came to a tarry repentance and arranged for the levy of a tax to satisfy the judgment. So the great question remains undetermined, and it is to be hoped that no State will venture again to evade its bounden duty under the Constitution of the United States.

Such are some of the problems that have faced the Supreme Court of the United States in the discharge of its high function as an inter-State tribunal. The limits of a review preclude a more detailed examination of these questions, and I hope that I have said enough to send the reader to the pages of Dr. Scott's analysis. It is evident that the difficulties which have confronted the American Supreme Court will be magnified tenfold for any permanent tribunal that is charged with the duty of settling disputes among the nations of the world. Even in their early and most troubled days, the States of the American Union were bound by the consciousness of a common origin and purpose and by countless bonds of race, language, and institutions. The international court of the future will have to deal with nations that are separated by every circumstance that can act as a cause of disunion among men.

But to say this is not to utter a cry of despair. The path is difficult, and it would be foolish to ignore the difficulties, but it is not impossible. We must not look for immediate results. It took the best part of a century to establish confidence in the American Supreme Court under conditions infinitely more favourable. Our immediate duty is to convince the world that in all normal cases the judicial settlement of international disputes is the only right method. Of course we must recognize that there may be exceptions, just as we know that there are times when the most peaceful citizen may have to fight for his life against a burglar. But if we can establish a court upon sound foundations, and if the court can justify itself before men by the wisdom and justice of its decisions, then we may hope that it will, as time goes on, gradually draw an increasing number of cases to its bar, until at last all normal causes of dispute among the nations are settled by peaceful means. Such is the lesson to be read in the history of the Supreme Court of the United States.