(*September 2, 1933*)

The British Commonwealth and the League of Nations*

By Lord Robert Cecil.

President Baxter, of The Empire Club:—We welcome today the members of the Canadian Club to this luncheon. We are honored today, deeply honored, with the presence of three great products of England. England has a happy faculty of breeding great men and great women. We have the unexpected honor today of having with us Captain and Mrs. James Mollison. On behalf of Capt. and Mrs. Mollison I express regrets to other organizations and individuals who have extended invitations to them during their brief stay in Toronto. Their visit with us today is due to the presence of Viscount Cecil.

Our guest speaker is Viscount Cecil. Lord Cecil is in Canada as head of the United Kingdom group in the British Commonwealth Relations Conference which today concludes its session at Hart House, a conference held to promote closer cooperation and better understanding amongst the nations of the Empire. The subject of His Lordship today is the British Commonwealth and the League of Nations. It is a subject of momentous interest to the entire world, and of particular import to this audience and the larger audience hooked up by radio from Halifax to Vancouver.

We welcome you, Lord Cecil. Your career is well known to us all. The part you have played in world affairs has portrayed a man of high faith and courageous heart. In the traditions of Britain the legends of Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table in their quest of the Grail are glorious. Today there is a grail which beckons

*A joint meeting with the Empire Club.

not to one nation but to the entire civilized world. I refer to world peace, the cause in which you, sir, have so greatly distinguished yourself. The League of Nations is today a potent moral force in world affairs due in large measure to your patience and crusading fervor. You have labored long and earnestly in quest of the grail. Your zeal has not weakened. Your faith has not fallen. Your advocacy and championship of peace have brought you world-wide distinction. On behalf of the Canadian and Empire Clubs I welcome you as a friend of humanity.

Lord Cecil:—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to preface my observations by expressing my thanks to Captain and Mrs. Mollison for their presence here this afternoon. It shows, I am convinced, their interest in the great cause of peace, and of such advocates of peace it cannot be said that their advocacy is due to any want of personal courage.

I have undertaken to speak to you about the Commonwealth and the League. They are, in their present form, recent developments. No doubt in one sense the Commonwealth has existed for many years but in its present form, which I will describe in a moment, it is quite modern. And the League of Nations, although it also has a very long history behind it, yet, in the realizatiin of the aspirations of many generations of thinkers and well-wishers, that realization has only taken place in the last fifteen years. The Commonwealth and the League have many differences, but they are great institutions whose existence is dependent upon the fact that they are both striving for the betterment and improvement of mankind. I will not admit that in this respect the objects and purposes of the Commonwealth are one whit inferior to the objects and purposes of the League of Nations.

We speak of these institutions. They can be called institutions. What exactly do we mean by it? The Commonwealth is in its present form a group of nations, independent, autonomous nations, bound together by a common allegiance to the Crown, by common traditions and still more, as I think, by common aspirations. The Commonwealth stands, as I see it, for the great cause of

ordered progress throughout the world and particularly throughout the Commonwealth, and is based on the great principles of liberty and justice. The nations of the Commonwealth form part of the League of Nations on exactly the same footing, with exactly the same rights, as all the other nations which are members of that institution. You will all remember that when peace was made at Paris, after some little discussion, it was agreed by all those who became members of the League of Nations that the self-governing Dominions and India should be admitted as members of the League of Nations with full rights and privileges in that respect. They have their full rights and privileges and conversely, of course, they are bound by all the traditions of the Covenant of the League of Nations, of which they form a part. They are bound in honor by their signature to the Covenant to carry out its purposes, and to fight—I don't mean physically but morally and spiritually—for peace, international co-operation and progress. And as for the League, that too is a free association of independent and civilized nations, all brought together from all quarters of the world, including every type of humanity, every race, every religion, every culture. There are some fifty-five of them now, practically all the important nations of the world, with one or two exceptions, and they are brought together to carry out great objectives for the advancement of mankind.

I am not going to make many quotations but I should like just to read to you once again the preamble of the Covenant which set forth the purpose for which the League exists. It exists "to promote international co-operation, to achieve international peace and security by acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct between governments, by the maintenance of justice, and of scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another." That is the great purpose for which the League exists. I venture to say to you and to any, with great confidence, that those great

purposes are absolutely identical with the tradition and aspirations of the Commonwealth and the Dominions which make part of the Commonwealth in all external affairs.

I am not going to weary you, this afternoon with a discussion, which is probably well known to all of you, of the machinery of the League or even of its achievements, great and striking and outstanding as those achievements have been. But I am going to discuss two or three aspects of it in relation to the Commonwealth. I find in my own country and echoed to some extent in Canada a curious illusion that there is some kind of opposition between the League and the Commonwealth. I hear distinguished persons and some who are not so distinguished say that they prefer the Commonwealth to the League and others, who as I think are equally foolish, say they prefer the League to the Commonwealth. There is no opposition of that kind, I can assure you, between the two institutions. You might almost as well say you prefer lunch to dinner or dinner to lunch. It is pure nonsense. There is no such opposition. The League, in my view, is a great guarantee for the existence of the Commonwealth, for the Commonwealth, I will not say depends on peace, but can only flourish and progress in time of peace and the League stands for peace. And the Commonwealth is a great buttress of the League of Nations, one of those elements on which humanity has a right to rely, and believe me, really is one of the great forces which are upholding the League in its great struggle for peace and progress. There can be no opposition between them. They are working for the same causes. The Commonwealth is part of the League. The League is the guarantee of the Commonwealth and the only conceivable opposition, the only possible opposition would be if the Commonwealth were in a fit of insanity to try and carry on some aggressive war in breach of its obligations under the Covenant. I am sure every single soul in this room agrees that would be absolutely madness.

I know that there is a kind of conception—you find it in foreign countries quite often, and I find curious traces

of it even in Canada — that the United Kingdom, that country simply penetrated with the idea and the love of peace, is capable of plotting for the most sordid and commercial reasons some great attack on its neighbors, of carrying on what in the cant phrase are called imperialistic wars. You will see it carried to its extreme in certain areas in Germany, where many before the war were fond of describing Britain as the robber state which was flourishing on the ill-gotten gains of a disreputable military policy and a still more disceputable diplomacy. While, if there were ever any truth in that statement (and in my judgment, there never was) it certainly cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be regarded as true of the British Commonwealth or the United Kingdom at the present day. For them to indulge in wars of aggression would be the height of folly as well as of wickedness. It would be worse than a crime. It would be a blunder. We certainly have no intention or desire of attacking our neighbors or interfering with the existing order of things. If that be so, and I believe everybody in this room will agree with me that it is so, what is it the people mean who suggest that there is this opposition between the Commonwealth and the League? I think it is rather different in most men's minds to what I have been trying to describe. I think they conceive the League as a kind of rival to the Commonwealth, as taking the place in men's minds of the Commonwealth, as setting up a new object of loyalty or affection or whatever it may be, and they fear that those who adhere to the League will be neglectful of the safety and interests of the Commonwealth. I believe that to be a profound mistake. People say, "How can you expect the people of the United Kingdom to go on supporting armaments for her defence and protection so long as she is a member of the League. There will be a tendency, they say, for her to put aside all such armaments and rely entirely on the protection of the League. Well, ladies and gentlemen, some day that may be so. Some day we may see the League in such a position of established safety and established authority that not only British armament but armaments throughout the world will become unnecessary. We

would all rejoice if it were so. But for myself I must say quite frankly that I do not think it is practical at the present moment for any country that has to carry on relations with foreign countries to abandon armaments altogether. I think, that as long as other nations have armaments, as long as they are armed, and as long as in some cases we only too regretfully notice statesmen and people indulging in nationalistic speeches and actions, I think it is impossible to rule out as a conceivable event an attack by some nation on the British Empire or the British Commonwealth on some occasion. But that does not alter the fact in my judgment that, though it is impossible for us here and now—I am speaking of the United Kingdom and the British Commonwealth—to abandon all armaments and to trust to the good feeling of other countries, I am quite convinced that it is our duty to do our utmost to induce other nations to agree to a reduction and limitation of armaments by intrenational agreement. I say that that is desirable. I believe you may go further and say it is absolutely essential. It is essential for the continued existence and prosperity of the Commonwealth and essential for the continued existence of the civilized world.

We do need a reduction of armaments. As I have said I do not think we can safely do it by ourselves but we do need it profoundly. We need it in the first place for the not inconsiderable motive at the present time in order to save money, to save expenditure on an object which is altogether economically unremunerative. We, in England, spend something like one hundred and ten million pounds a year, that is about $550,000,000 a year on armaments. Other nations spend more. The world at large spends annually not less than one thousand million pounds — $5,000,000,000 on armaments. Conceive that enarmous drain on the resources of the world. Conceive the madness of allowing that drain to go on when we know the whole world is suffering deeply from an economic crisis unparalleled in living history. Therefore, merely for the purpose of saving money a reduction of armaments by international agreement is of the utmost importance.

But that is not the only thing. It is said that even if

countries were unarmed they could fight. So they could. You can see the boys fighting in the streets and nations, I suppose, could fight with their fists even if they got rid of armaments altogether. And you won't get rid of armaments altogether. Why then is it important from the point of view of peace, apart from economics, to reduce armaments? It is important for this reason, that as long as these great armaments exist there must be carried on in every country — not in Canada I know, but in most countries they have armaments, particularly in Europe—in order to justify the expenditure on armaments, in order to induce their people to agree to the expenditure, there has to be carried on more or less openly, more or less secretly, a great campaign in favor of military forces, and in the last resort in favor of war.

Those of us who remember the condition of the world before 1914 will know exactly what I am referring to and will be able to give instance after instance of the kind of campaign that was carried on, in certain European countries particularly, justifying war, regarding it as the great expression of national virility and strength, and glorifying every aspect of it and every instrument by which it was carried on. If you can once get the nations to turn their minds from that conception and to say while we cannot get rid of armaments altogether at the moment, we do recognize that the great objective should be to diminish them immediately and, in the long distant future it may be, to get rid of them altogether. If you can once get them into that mind you change the whole conception, you put war as it ought to be, as only justifiable, if it is justifiable at all, as a desperate and final necessity which ought to be avoided at all costs and by every means possible. And although it may not be practical for the moment you set the mentality of the people in a new direction, and above all you diminish that tremendous burden that lies upon them at this moment and consequently diminish the necessity for justifying war and armaments, which goes on in so many countries at the present time.

There is a third reason which to honorable men is not less strong. When the powers were assembled at the

Conference in Paris they determined to place upon their defeated foes very stringent obligations to reduce their armaments and those stringent obligations were accepted. But they were not accepted without negotiations. As is well known the Germans addressed a formal question to the victorious powers. They said in substance, "If we disarm, if we cut down our armaments to the extent—and it was a tremendous extent—which you demand, are you going to remain armed?" And the reply given to them by Monsieur Clemenceau speaking on behalf of the victorious powers, Canada, the United Kingdom, everyone of them, was, "Not at all."

We require the Germans to disarm, first because in our view they were responsible, rightly or wrongly, that was the view held at the time, for the outbreak of the war, but when they have disarmed then, indeed, the other countries will follow suit. That was the substance of Clemenceau's letter which has been so often quoted. And they were not content with that. They put a definite provision into the provisions of the disarmament clause which were required by Germany, saying this was the necessary prelude to general disarmament, and since that time we, the United Kingdom and all the other powers of the League of Nations, have affirmed over and over again their desire and purpose to bring about a system of general reduction and limitation of armaments similar to though not necessarily absolutely identical with, that which was imposed on the defeated powers at the Paris Conference.

Well, it seems to me, and has long seemed to me, that that was an obligation of honor if ever there was one. We do not wish to say in our country at any rate that we treat obligations of that kind as scraps of paper.

Can we reduce armaments with safety? I think we can. I think you can at any rate make a great beginning. This Disarmament Conference is to meet again in three weeks and it will depend upon the attitude of the British Commonwealth and some other powers, but mainly the British Commonwealth, what is going to be the result and position of that conference. I say they ought at any rate to express their willingness to apply those portions of the

treaty of Versailles which forbids to Germany and other powers the possession of certain great classes of armaments on the ground that those armaments are essential if you want to make an attack upon your neighbor. Armaments of aggression they have come to be called. I do not defend the scientific accuracy of that expression but it is quite near enough for all practical purposes. Armaments of aggression! Air craft of a military and naval character; tanks; great land guns; submarines; and even the gigantic battleships. All these things were forbidden to Germany because they are regarded as armaments of aggression. If we are clear, as I hope we are clear, that we do not intend to commit aggression, what justification have we for maintaining those armaments which have been defined by the agreement of all of us as armaments of aggression in the hands of Germany? And if you could arrive at some step of that kind by agreement then you have got to do two things, or one other thing at any rate, you have to take precautions that after the treaty has been accepted there is no re-armament by those who have accepted the new level of armaments under the treaty.

For that purpose you require, I think, two main classes of provisions. You will require the establishment for the first time of an international authority whose business it shall be to watch over the execution of the treaty. That is a new conception but one of enormous value. It would be there. It would be constituted with headquarters, I suppose, at Geneva. It would take whatever steps it thought right and above all it would follow the expenditure and the actions of all the different countries and would very soon be able to ascertain that one country or another was making a very strange addition to its expenditure if it was to keep within the terms of the treaty. And then you have got to have, I think one other thing—if you find a nation that is rearming in breach of its agreement you are to say, as you must say, the only reason that that rearmament is taking place is because such a nation contemplates and is prepared for an aggressive policy. You treat them as threatening aggression on the other nations of the world, and you say to them, as you must say, that

unless you abandon that policy we must have nothing further to do with you. We must cut off all commercial and other relations with you until you conform to the agreement. These are not mere theories. They have been discussed at the Conference and very largely approved. If you have got something of that kind you would have no weakening as I see it of the defence of any country. The weakening would be in the power of attack but it would really strengthen their powers of defence because if you weakened the power of attack all round it is evident the powers of defence become relatively stronger and you would help to destroy war.

Let me say one or two words about that before I pass on to my final observation. One of the great dangers of the present situation which would be eliminated if you could get a voluntary agreement of that kind by all the great powers of the world, is the possibility of competition in armaments. I need not develop that. It is quite plain if you compete in armaments you have immediately in every parliament, in every discussion where there is not a parliament, a suggestion that you have got to increase your armaments because such and such a country is arming, or is dangerous to you unless you do so. That is common form. You cannot read a debate in England, and I do not think we are particularly warlike, you cannot read a debate on army or navy or air estimates without continual argument, particularly on the navy and air estimates, to the effect that such and such a country is much superior to us in that particular arm; such and such a country has a position which is dangerous to us from a certain point of view; and therefore the Minister says: "We must make this increase." Obviously discussions of that kind, points of view of that kind, are the very antithesis of peaceful relations throughout the world. If you are always regarding your neighbor as a possible burglar, you are not going to carry on completely amicable relations with him.

Then there is another great source I think of danger in the present state of things unless you can get some control and limitation of armaments, and that is in the fact that great interests exist whose prosperity depends

upon the continued demand for weapons of war. I do not want to say anything derogatory of those gentlemen, but such great financial interests must desire to see the continuance at any rate from a business point of view, of bad relations between countries, of political unrest, because that makes a demand for the particular kind of goods they have got to sell. Surely that is not a state of things which conduces to the peace of the world. It seems to me we ought to control the manufacture of armaments sufficiently to eliminate the element of pecuniary gain from their manufacture. We ought to treat them as we treat — at any rate, I suppose in Canada too, as we treat the manufacture of noxious drugs — and I see no real distinction between the man who manufactures heroin for the purpose of corrupting his fellow men and the man who manufactures weapons that can only be used for the slaughter of other human beings. Heroin and rifles are both things which in certain circumstances have their legitimate use, but they ought to be controlled as we do control one set of commodities — both sets of commodities ought to be controlled so they will only be used, and only be made and sold for legitimate and proper purposes.

It is said further that all this is a wrong way of proceeding, that what you ought to aim at is such a degree of preparation that victory is certain, and if you have got that it is real protection against war and the best guarantee of peace. Well, obviously if every country sets about that ideal you will have in the first place great competition, and in the second place it is quite clear it cannot be true of every country that they should be superior to every other country. The old doctrine, the old hoary falsehood, that if you want peace you should prepare for war, is one of the doctrines which has done the most harm in my judgement in the whole history of the human race. The truth is, (and that it is the truth we at any rate in this generation ought to recognize) that in war there is no victory. It does not exist. There are different degrees of defeat, and every one, whether they call themselves victors or the reverse, every one of them suffers, as in the case of this war they suffered, very severely indeed. It is true — I

know it is true, absolutely true — that peace is the greatest of British interests, far greater than any other of those interests of which we hear, or used to hear, so much, and it is not only the greatest of British interests but it is the greatest interest of every nation in the world.

Then I will come back to my theme—this was a digression—and explain to you why I do not believe there was any rivalry between the League and the Commonwealth. But it is put sometimes in rather a different way by very well-meaning people. I have often heard it said, the Commonwealth is a small league of Nations. I see what they mean and there is a sense in which that is true. But unfortunately they are distinct conceptions. The Commonwealth as I have said more than once is a part of the League. In exactly the same way as the United Kingdom, the nations of Scotland, Wales and England, a unit of itself, is a part of the Commonwealth. It is just the same thing. The Commonwealth is a part of the League just as the United Kingdom is a part of the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth must be regarded in that way. It cannot be regarded as aiming at bringing peace to the world by itself. It cannot be the policeman of the world. It is quite impossible even if it were to join with the United States of America, as some people suggest, even that great combination, immensely powerful as it would be, would never be able by force, which is the conception I suppose that the people have in mind, to establish peace in the world. And I think it more than doubtful whether you would persuade the United States of America to enter upon an adventure of that kind. But the truth is that whether the group is small or great you cannot in modern days—I do not think you ever could—hope to establish a group which can give laws to the world, and that is what people mean. It cannot be done. Nor is it possible as some people think for any group to retire within some Chinese wall and say they have nothing to do with any other nation in the world and are going to get entirely clear of the lesser breeds without the wall. It cannot be done. The world is one for most purposes, in the cultural, scientific, spiritual, commercial, and in many other ways;

the languages are one and must be one, interdependent as they must be.

The thing we have to do is as members of that community of nations to see whether we cannot do something to make it better before we die, and as part of the League we can unquestionably do a very great deal. The Commonwealth—it may be with the assistance of America; if not, without—can do very much inside the League in order to carry on the great work to which the League has set its hand. I know there are people who urge that the League has become a complete failure, that it is not able to discharge its duty. Recent events have shown that it is weak and possibly inconclusive. And they cite always the great case of the Manchurian question, the great case of the Far East. Well, they readily and easily forget the astonishing the amazing success of the League in the years up until the last year or two, the immense advance in international solidarity and international peace that has been achieved at Geneva. But let us take them on Manchuria for a moment. Is it true in that case that the combination of the nations has been wholly ineffective? I say not. It is quite true there has been very bad fighting but technically, at any rate there has been no war, and that is more than a technical consideration. If you compare the slaughter that went on in the great war to the deaths that have been occasioned in the contest between Japan and China you will see there is something to be said for the advantage even of avoiding technically a war. But more than that, you had — and that is perhaps the greatest of advantages — you had no scramble of the other nations for some bit of China. If this controversy had taken place before the League of Nations every nation almost — at any rate every nation with interests in the far east — would have demanded some benefit, some bit of China, as compensation for what Japan had taken. And finally, and although the end is not yet and it has not been effective yet, there has been a formal demand by all the nations of the world for the policing of Japan and it is surely a great thing to have got that great solemn, universal declaration supporting the principles of justice and peace in the relations of one nation with another.

But I do not deny that there has been a failure. There has been fighting; there has been conquest. The League has not succeeded in restraining Japan from a policy of adventure and aggression. And why is that? It is the point that comes home to you and to me. Why hasn't it succeeded? It has nothing to do with the machinery of the League for after all the League is essentially machinery; nothing to do with that. Whenever it has been tried for any purpose, whether for making inquiries or pronouncing judgment, the machine has worked quite well and perfectly. What has failed has been the will to use that machinery to the utmost on the part of the nations who desire to keep the peace. That is what has failed. If the nations had combined to say to Japan, "Stop, or we shall cut off all our relations with you," I have no doubt whatever Japan would have stopped. She could have done no other. And if we have to admit that there has been a failure of the League, or rather a failure of the members who make up the League, no doubt there are many reasons for it; no doubt many excuses; but if there has been that failure then we all of us—at any rate our nations—must take part of the responsibility for that failure.

I do not deny that the absence of the United States of America from the League — in this case it is a splendid instance—has weakened the power of international control which the League ought to possess. At the same time the true conclusion is surely that if the League has failed it has failed because it is not strong enough. That is not a reason for abandoning the League or decrying it. That is a reason for saying to our Governments and peoples, "You have got to be stronger. You have to use the League to its full power. It is your business to use this great instrument of peace in order to secure the maintenance of the peace of the world." I venture to impress that upon you, for I am convinced that in this matter the responsibility of the Commonwealth — and I will add to the Commonwealth the United States of America taken together, for in a policy of this kind their aspirations and objects are usually the same — I say the responsibility is very great, very great indeed. I hear certain Canadians

tell me you are in a position of great security in Canada. You do not need to trouble about what occurs to any other parts of the world. Whatever happens you are safe. I don't know whether that is true or not. But surely that is not an argument which is going to appeal to a great and generous people like the people of Canada. They are not going to say we are safe. We do not mind what happens to the rest of the world; so long as we can go on prosperously and develop in our country, it matters nothing to us. That is not what they are going to say. They are going to say, "We have a duty to our fellow-men and just as the individual has a duty to his fellow-men so the nations have a duty to their fellow-nations." Even if it be true, and I doubt whether it is, that you are so secure you need not mind about the troubles of the rest of the world, you still are bound — bound — to do your utmost to preserve the peace of the world.

And do not doubt that you have immense power. The position of the Commonwealth is one of unrivalled power amongst the nations of the world. I assure you that, from my personal knowledge, and it will not be contradicted by any person of any kind of responsibility, they have immense power. The nations of the world look to the Commonwealth, look to the United Kingdom perhaps in the first instance, but to the Commonwealth as a whole, to judge and decide what should be done by the international authorities in great crises. We stand, we in the Commonwealth, just because we stand apart, just because in various degrees we are not mixed up with the controversies of Europe or anywhere else, we have a position of impartiality and authority which no other nation has, excepting perhaps the United States. We can give our opinion and our opinion will be listened to and if we decide to take no action, war may again come upon the world and even if we should escape immediate and direct contact with it, we should be responsible for the nameless horrors and suffering which war creates. And remember, terrible as the last war was, horrible beyond description as some of its incidents were, the next war by all accounts will be far worse. Not only have great advances, I think they are called, been

made in engineering science which will enable men more easily and surely to destroy their fellow men, but the fact that we are growing year by year, day by day, closer to one another means that any disaster that affects one nation spreads over the whole world. It is no exaggeration to say if there is another war, it will not only be an orgy of cruelty as every war is, but it will be a dangerous step, perhaps more than a dangerous step, towards the destruction of civilization and the re-establishment of chaos in the world. That is the issue that is before us. You cannot escape. The decision of which way the world is to turn, towards progress or chaos, rests with you. Posterity is waiting for your decision. And I pray Heaven that the decision may be right.

President Baxter (of the Empire Club)—Mr. Harry Sifton, President of the Canadian Club, will express our thanks.

President Harry Sifton (of the Canadian Club)—Members of the Empire and Canadian Clubs, it has been my privilege to be asked to express in some manner our gratitude to Lord Robert Cecil for coming to us today. Before trying to do that I want to thank the Empire Club, executive and president, on behalf of the members of the Canadian Club, for inviting us to join with them today in luncheon and listen to the marvellous address of hope and confidence. The speaker of the day has a position of significance which strikes the imagination and the ambition of anyone who knows anything about him. It is a rather interesting fact that his family dates back as British nobles to the days of Queen Elizabeth. Through the centuries the Cecils have had great positions in the public confidence in Great Britain. What type of mind should be more open to the fascination of the idea of an Empire of force, an Empire buttressed by the strong right arm of British armament, the idea that peace should be extended to the whole world by the force of British arms? One would imagine, if I may so refer to Lord Robert Cecil, that his mind would be bound to be influenced by that type of idea. But the fact that such an idea made no appeal to him at all has proved again the capacity of the human mind to

take the high level which separates us from the type of animal that is not spiritually in the same class as man. At the right time, by some strange fate, Great Britain produces the man ready to sacrifice everything dear to him in the interests of some great ideal, practically expressed, capable of achievement, for which the world for all time is definitely in debt to him. Lord Cecil appreciated the fact that the system of the balance of power, the careful, scientific acquisition of armaments on the one side or the other, was bound inevitably to lead to a final war which would destroy civilization, of which we are so proud, just as surely as former civilization was destroyed by the same methods. He appreciated the possibility of a world-wide association for the preservation of peace which would call upon the common people of the world to risk one tenth in the interests of peace for the ten tenths they were accustomed to risk in the interests of war. His message is a message of relief and the only form of relief which the world presents from the terrible scourge under which it has suffered. And may I be permitted to say that the people of Canada and the world over thank Providence for Robert Cecil and wish him God Speed in his great services to humanity.

(Mrs. Capt. James Mollison then addressed the meeting briefly.)