

witnessed the usual course of procedure there over a number of years, describe the distinction in this way: he said that in the United States a judge must first be elected, but in the Dominion of Canada a judge must first be defeated. (Laughter.) In this there is a lot more truth than appears on the surface, and when I see the type of your elected judges my sense of shock at your method is not quite so great as it was (laughter).

The President of the American Bar and some other speakers have referred, with tones of regret, to the presence of miscreants and defaulters in your number, and this gives me occasion to mention the otherwise insignificant fact that I am no longer in the active practice of law. For the first time in my life I have some little sense of self-congratulation that I have emerged from the profession into the field of finance, where, of course, such beings are not known at all. (Laughter.)

My purpose is to treat of a subject not within the special purview of lawyers, and my only reason for doing so is that it is the topic which most engrosses us across the line and which, in my judgment, is of paramount consequence in all its bearings to the people of both countries. I want to say something on the relations between this Republic and the Empire of which Canada forms a part, to make an appeal for a continuance of the best relations which have subsisted, and for an atmosphere of mutual trust, the one people with the other.

It would be impossible to make any contribution to the general subject within the limit allotted me, and consequently I shall seek to confine my remarks to the history of one phase alone, because I believe that history is misunderstood—not only in this country but even in our own—and that the misunderstanding has just possibly served to sow seeds of distrust and misgivings—seeds which, if they germinate, might be fatal to the weal of mankind.

What I refer to especially is the history of what has become known as the Anglo-French Compromise, the terms of which only some few weeks ago were disclosed. Certain Canadians, now citizens of your country, who are as anxious as we are that no clouds of misunderstanding even the size of a man's hand should ever arise, have expressed, on their return to the old home, apprehensions that a wrong conception of the history

of this phase of our relations is doing harm in this Republic, and anxiety that Canada should do something to perform the function, which undoubtedly is hers, of maintaining to the utmost a feeling of trust and confidence between these nations.

Canada, of course, is not a bit different from her Motherland in her recognition of the importance which attaches to this matter. The one strongest and most potent of all cornerstones of civilization is a simple, dependable understanding between the English-speaking races. I think I am not overstating the fact when I say that a recognition of that necessity has been, is and must be the main element of British policy. But Canada regards this necessity not only as paramount but, for us, a very matter of life and death. For us it is all and all, and our anxiety in the matter you can quite understand. But, anxious as I am that the necessary brevity imposed upon me shall not result in a mere fragmentary discussion of the subject, which might be more misleading than useful, I hasten to state what I believe are the facts in relation to this one topic.

We all, of course, must keep in mind the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in a general way and the obligations imposed upon all the signatories of that treaty in its League of Nations provisions for a subsequent attempt on the part of each and all to come to some arrangement for the continuous and effective limitation of armaments. Not only was this duty imposed expressly by the terms of that treaty upon all the signatories thereto, but it was also one of the understandings embodied in and growing out of the Locarno treaties which subsequently were made between Germany, France and England.

Pursuant to those understandings there was established a Preparatory Commission on Disarmament—a sort of a committee emanating from the League of Nations but on which, fortunately, the United States of America was represented. The presence of the United States representative was a factor the importance of which could not be overestimated. This Commission met and, with the subject which I am coming to now, dealt for the first time in the month of March, 1927.

A chief object of the Preparatory Commission was to endeavor to find some method or formula upon which the final judgment of the Commission might be based limiting arma-