

orphans; 5,000,000 war widows; 20,000,000 helpless, wounded, broken men, and 50,000,000 starving unemployed. In the background of this picture are the ruins of churches and buildings and human institutions which had been constructed by the toil and sacrifice of centuries. A Canadian writer suggests that the statesmen and politicians of the world, particularly those selected for the Disarmament Conference, should conjure up that ghastly spectacle.

Excessive armaments, I repeat, are the outward and visible sign of minds which regard war as normal. Every one of the great powers, except Germany, is spending far more on armaments today than was spent before the war; one writer puts it at 70% more than in 1913. Despite all high-sounding phrases and international pacts, the land, sea and air forces of 1931 are far more formidable than those of 1914. Let us turn to history for a lesson. We saw how constant war preparation, reacting on and reacted upon by a false philosophy, transformed a peaceful people into a warlike one. We saw the steady, quiet German becomes a cold, ruthless fighter. Armaments have always been created to be used. History has shown us over and over again that nations brought up to the use of arms will use arms. The world expenditure on armaments today is officially estimated by the League of Nations at forty-five hundred million dollars each year. We are reminded of the words of Viscount Grey, Foreign Minister in England in the years before the War, when he told the world:

"The enormous growth of armaments in Europe, the sense of insecurity and fear caused by them—it is these that make war inevitable."

Gentlemen, it is useless and futile to talk about "the war being over," for the whole thought of humanity IS war. There may be peace here, or peace there, temporarily; but man is essentially and forever at war. The volcano may burst out in one place or another, the eruption may kill millions or only thousands, but until the peoples of the world refuse to go on living on the slopes of the volcano, sitting on top of the ammunition, there can be no peace. No, my

friends; nineteen hundred years after the coming of the Prince of Peace we are still at war. It is but nonsense to talk of this or that people as "peace-loving." There is no peace; you cannot love a negation. You yourselves are spending \$2,000,000 a day on war, and no nation has made greater progress since 1918 in promoting the strength and effectiveness of its military power. *The mere fact that the guns are not being fired at this moment does not alter the situation:*—the hideous fact is that mankind is still at war.

Since the War certain steps have been taken, certain agreements made which it was fondly hoped would lessen the possibility of hostilities. A League of Nations was created and machinery for its functioning established. It lacked certain elements of strength from its beginning: your great nation stood out, and Russia was not admitted. Furthermore, in a world which still thinks in terms of force it lacked the means to enforce its wishes and decisions. That positive weakness has been woefully apparent in recent months and confidence in the League rudely shaken. Then we have relied on Washington Pacts—and I shall not be thought rude if I intimate that we have been disappointed. And last, we had the Kellogg-Briand treaty which registered the determination of over sixty countries, including yours and mine,

"that they condemned recourse to war . . . and renounced it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another; and that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature . . . should never be sought except by pacific means."

Could anything be more explicit? But how honest were the countries that signed? Let us be honest. *If we are not going to use war as an instrument of national policy, surely we do not require the great armaments of to-day.* As for the Kellogg-Briand treaty, it has had its test in the past months in the Orient, that new centre of world politics, and there is only one thing to be said of the result, the Kellogg-Briand treaty has failed, if words mean anything, whatever excuses may be offered. Those who will fearlessly face facts will see that all these treaties, peace pacts, promises, can-