

And with you students of America there are lining up, keeping step with your ranks, an uncounted host of college men in every nation under heaven. Students of every race and tongue, with hearts like yours and a faith like yours, have like you seen the vision and are obedient to the heavenly calling. We here are only one company among the more than 150,000 students in over 2,200 universities and colleges enrolled in the World's Student Christian Federation. Out of that great host leaders of men are going by the hundreds into the highways of more than forty nations. Where they go a spark disturbs the clod. Things are astir. Conditions are shaping the world over for great events. Ours is the crisis time of the nations. Its issue will be peace for the world or it will be war and woe. In the name of the Prince of Peace, let the nations of the Anglo-American Fraternity make it peace."

The Enemy of Social Reform.

Address of Hon. Phillip Snowden, M. P., at the Annual Meeting of the Peace Society, Mansion House, London, May 8, 1912.

(From the *Herald of Peace*.)

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The resolution that I am called upon to propose makes reference to the paradox to which you, Mr. Chairman, also referred in your opening speech—namely, the undoubted increase in the sentiment in favor of peace and the equally undoubted fact of an increase in the expenditure upon armaments and upon war. Public attention has been very markedly called during the last year or two to the contention that nations do not gain by war, but I think that one explanation of the maintenance of our armies and our navies, and of this continual increase in the sums devoted to their support, is to be found in this fact—that while nations may not, and indeed do not, gain from war, there are many individuals in nations who do profit from war. (Hear, hear!) You, Mr. Chairman, stated that the ten great powers of the world are spending this year more than £300,000,000 upon armaments. This country is spending something like one-fourth of that. We cannot spend £75,000,000 a year without creating personal interests in the maintenance of that expenditure. (Hear, hear!) Somebody gains by the expenditure of £75,000,000 a year, and every increase in the expenditure upon armaments increases the number of those who are interested in the maintenance of the increase in such an expenditure. We find this truth obviously manifest every time that naval and military expenditure is discussed in the House of Commons. We always have the opposition of Members of Parliament who represent constituencies which share in the expenditure of this money and take the profits of this expenditure. (Hear, hear!) But I think it is, nevertheless, true, Mr. Chairman, as you and the other speakers have said, that the sentiment in favor of peace is growing. Why, everybody believes in peace in the abstract, and nobody is in favor of war in the abstract, and I think that the reason I have given just now is the explanation of this apparent paradox—that while everybody professes to be in favor of peace, the expenditure upon war continues to advance because of the personal, individual, and selfish interests which per-

sons have in the maintenance of this expenditure. Now I am here this afternoon, I take it, as being in some regard specially representative of that working-class to whom complimentary reference has been made more than once already in this meeting. I am proud, Mr. Chairman, to be here to represent an international movement which has always been sound upon the question of peace. (Cheers.) The workers of this country and the workers of other lands recognize that their interests are not in war, that their interests are not in expenditure upon armaments. They recognize that expenditure upon armaments is the enemy of social reform. So long as present ideas dominate in regard to national taxation we must recognize that the money spent upon our Navy and the money spent upon our Army means so much less for the purposes of social reform. (Applause.) I have never heard a demand put forward in the House of Commons for more expenditure upon social reform; I have never heard a demand made for a better Old Age Pensions Act, for more money for that beneficent department over which you, Mr. Chairman, preside; I have never heard the demand put forward for the better housing of the people, but that demand has always been met by the plea that it was impossible to find the money because of the already swollen amount of our national expenditure. And yet we find the money for war, for the army and for the navy in the last twenty years—I find the expenditure upon the navy has risen from £14,000,000 to £44,000,000 a year. We are spending this year out of the total taxed revenue of the country between twelve and thirteen shillings in the £ to pay for war—past, present, and future. Such an expenditure for such a purpose is a disgrace to a nation—(applause)—which professes to be a civilized and a Christian nation. Reference was made by the last speaker to the great work that might be done in the interests of peace by inculcating peace principles in the minds of the children in our public schools; but there is an agency in this country which might do an infinitely greater work for peace than that if it would rise to the height of its responsibility and be really true to the message and the legacy of the Prince of Peace, whom it professes to serve. (Cheers.) The Christian Church has it in its hands to settle the problem of war, and if they won't do it, then their duty will be discharged by others. We are hearing a great deal in these days about the alienation of the masses from the Christian Church. I speak of what I know when I say, if the masses of the people are ceasing to attend the church services it is not because they are becoming less religious; it is because their religion is becoming of a more practical character—(applause)—and they are finding an outlet for their altruism, they are finding an outlet in other channels. The greatest agency, I repeat, today which is working for international peace is not the agency which ought to be doing that work, the Christian Church, but it is the international organized labor movement. (Applause.) The conferences between the workers of different countries, to which the last speaker referred, are doing side by side more than all the visits of your diplomatists, than all that is being done in the chambers of your diplomacy; they are doing more to bring about a better feeling between the workers of the world. What has maintained European peace more than all else during the last thirty

years is this growing solidarity amongst the working classes of the different European countries. (Applause.) Now here you have the great hope of peace, and in this movement I believe that this country may take, as it certainly ought from its past history to take, a leading part. Mr. Chairman, you referred to the fact that those who advocate universal peace are often described as being mere visionaries and Utopians. I am not ashamed of being regarded as a visionary. I am an idealist, and, when people sneer at me for my idealism, the answer that I give to them is that the man who has no ideal is a man who has no idea. (Applause.) It is as true today as when the wise words were uttered, that where there is no vision the people perish, and I believe that the vision of a universal peace is a vision that is going to be realized. We want to change our ideal; we want to change our ideal of national greatness. We want to realize that it is a greater triumph for statesmanship to do something to brighten the homes of the people, to give a better education to the children, to do something to lessen the appalling evils of intemperance—(applause)—that it is a greater triumph of statesmanship to do that, and a wiser national economy to spend money upon doing these things than it is to add two or three more "Dreadnoughts" to the Navy. (Cheers.) We want to realize that a beautiful school is a grander sight than a battleship, and a happy peasantry than huge battalions. Now, I said just now that I believe this nation may take a foremost part in helping forward the speedy coming of this day. Let us try to carry out the ideal and the suggestion of the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who asked this country to take its place at the head of a world-wide league of peace. I believe that if we as a nation would do that, we may yet achieve a far greater and more imperishable empire. Inspired by our example, other nations will follow, saying, "This is glory, this is true dominion; these men build on eternal foundations; they are might, majesty, dominion and power." And I believe—I repeat, Mr. Chairman—that in spite of the fact that dark clouds still do lower, I believe that if we ascend to the mountain-top we shall see the sun still shines, and by and by it will burst through the clouds and shine again on a new-born world. (Applause.) Inspired by a holier conception of humanity, knowing we are all children of one common Father, men and women of every nation are being drawn together to fight in this the most righteous and glorious struggle the world has ever seen. They realize, they the workers of the world realize that they have no antagonisms, that they have no jealousies; they realize that they have a common enemy, and that militarism and military expenditure are the common enemies of the workers of all lands. (Applause.) They are beginning to realize that of all the great and priceless blessings of humanity the greatest of all is peace.

Mr. Philip Snowden, M. P., then moved the following resolution:

"This Annual Meeting of the Peace Society desires to express its regret at the inability of modern diplomacy to check the growth of military and naval armaments which form a continual menace and an ever-increasing burden;

"It acknowledges, with gratitude, the efforts which have been put forth by successive Chief Magistrates of

the City of London and their associates, for the promotion of a better understanding between nations, especially between our own country and Germany;

"And it welcomes all efforts which tend to remove international difficulties and misunderstandings, and so to open the way for a diminution in the costs of armaments, and for combined action in promoting peace."

The United States and Canada in Practical Arbitration.

By Hon. William Renwick Riddell, of Toronto, Canada.

Address at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, May 16, 1912.

The geographical relation between the United States and Canada (and I use the word "Canada" in the geographical and not the historical sense) permits, and indeed compels, these two countries to be an example to the rest of the world. They have the longest international boundary in the world; they also have vast realms which have not changed allegiance for a long period of time, and which have had no dislocation in form of government, etc.

No doubt the other conditions have been eminently promising for testing under most favorable terms the working of international treaties of arbitration. Those responsible for the policy on each side of the boundary were descended in great measure from the same stock; they had hundreds of years of history in common, the same language and laws, the same religion and manners, and in substance the same institutions, social and political. What is called, for want of a better word, the "genius" of the peoples was and is the same.

Until 1871 it may be said in general terms that the treaties were negotiated on the British side by statesmen in the Mother Country. These were indeed aided and instructed (so far as they would accept aid and instruction from "colonists") by Canadians, Nova Scotians, etc.; but they were not responsible to the people on the north side of the international boundary; their responsibility was to the people of the British Isles.

From and after 1871 it may be said again in general terms that the British side of the negotiations, so far as they affect Canada, had been conducted in fact, if not in form, by those responsible to Canadians, and the treaties have in that respect been in fact Canadian treaties. An interesting comparison might be drawn between the treaties before and after 1871, but this is not the place for it.

The long story begins with Jay's treaty of 1794, which provided for three Commissioners (one appointed by the King, one by the President, and the third chosen by these two, or if they could not agree, each was to name one and one of these chosen by lot) to determine the northeast boundary of the United States. This failed, and it was not until 1842 that the matter in dispute was settled. Jay's treaty also provided for the determination of the amount the United States should pay to British creditors on certain claims. The Commissioners for this purpose were five in number, two appointed by the King, two by the President, and the fifth by the unanimous voice of these four, or by lot. This also failed, and in 1802 a lump sum was agreed upon—£600,000.