

ing armies. So, in place of an army, Mr. MacLean would have an International Arbitration Committee.

The expense was another great consideration. If wars would cease, and the money which is annually devoted to that purpose be given to the poor, inside of ten years poverty would be abolished for ever.

Civilization demands the disarmament of the nations, so that the brotherhood of nations may be promoted. The evils of war are borne not only by those immediately concerned, but the effects last, and are handed down to succeeding generations. When once a nation has been seriously crippled by war it takes more than one generation to restore her to her former prestige.

Mr. Scrimger, in opening for the negative, endeavored to show how the only argument advanced by the affirmative was a finance one. He then went on to show that this is not a great barrier.

Though the desire for peace is in the air at the present time, still this is not causing a general disarmament of the nations. Although the Czar of Russia is at present making arrangements for a peace conference, still he is arming as never before. What does all this mean? Does it not mean that an increase in army and naval power is only one way of bringing about peace?

Look what a loss a general disarmament would be at the present day to the nations concerned.

Reforms must be gradual and it would be impossible for any philanthropist to conceive of such a thing as the immediate disarmament of all nations.

Fear is the great factor in preserving peace at the present day and the various armaments are only a guarantee of peace.

The prosperity of a nation depends on its armament. Commerce cannot be carried on without protection. Commerce promotes not brotherhood, but jealousy. This is another reason against disarmament. Piracy must be kept down, and a strong hand is needed for its suppression. The moral tone of the nations would also be lowered, because even