

of the American continent, north of the 45th line, we are all animated by one and the same sentiment, and I shall quote the words which that great French Canadian, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, uttered in a speech delivered at Somerset in 1887:

We form part of the British Empire, we are British subjects; and remember, gentlemen, all the dignity and pride that were involved in the title of a Roman citizen, at the beginning of the Roman Era when St. Paul, loaded with chains and on the point of being subjected to unworthy treatment, had only to exclaim: "I am a Roman citizen," to be treated with the respect to which he was entitled. We are British subjects and should be proud of the fact; we form part of the greatest empire on the globe and are governed by a constitution which has been the source of all the liberties of the modern world.

Therefore, I say, Sir, that from one ocean to the other there are different races which live in perfect understanding, rejoicing in the enjoyment of a prodigal nature, and forever grateful to Providence for having directed them to this Canadian land which is and will always be their only country.

The speech from the Throne draws the attention of the House to one subject in particular: The successful conclusion of peace; but the twenty-six first clauses of the treaty refer to the establishment of a League of Nations, and therefore they form part of the treaty.

The success which our armies had achieved last year could only pave the way to a bountiful peace.

The frightful war which was waged for four years and a half could not but leave devastation in its trail. Though we rejoice at the happy conclusion of peace, still the results of the struggle will be felt for a long while, and time only may partially heal the gaping wound. The consequences of the war are numerous; it cannot be denied that the evil has been and still is great.

Germany has suffered and is still suffering. She is not the only victim. The allied nations will also be confronted with after-war problems. These are as difficult for us to solve as they are for the conquered countries. It is only by a wise and energetic policy that we shall be enabled to solve them. Apart from the League of Nations, the treaty of peace as sanctioned by our representatives sitting on the Supreme Council of Nations, is worthy of our war policy and unreservedly meets our entire approval.

The League of Nations, forming part of the treaty, as advocated by the Council of the Powers represented at Versailles, is the

[Mr. Mackie.]

second question submitted to our consideration. To discuss it on its merits, to analyse the treaty clause by clause, to review minutely whatever is good, to condemn that which would be found detrimental and to draw the conclusions which must be logically inferred, would be a task I shall not undertake for numerous reasons. In the first place, all I could say on the matter would not alter at all the text of the Constitution which is to govern the League of Nations.

In the second place, my advice would not change in the least or would scarcely change the position which the Government is going to take as to the adoption of the principles governing a League of Nations.

In the third place, I have such little confidence in the success of the League, that, taking it as a whole, I would hesitate to approve of such a scheme. According to me, a league of nations is somewhat of an Utopia. Besides, this is my way of looking upon that idea itself, in the abstract. If a true league of nations could come to pass, it would certainly be the greatest achievement of this century, an unexampled ending to the war. Although human intelligence has reached the climax in this twentieth century of ours, the idea is not a new one. Long ago people thought of forming such a league. Is it not the great Italian, Mazzini, that prophet in exile, who had conceived a similar scheme? The nationalism of Mazzini and his associates, also refugees, was cosmopolitan; they wanted to secure the freedom of all the people that were worthy of sitting at the convivial table of the nations. Mazzini thought that the freedom of Italy, however triumphant she was, would be incomplete and precarious unless she became a member of a great brotherhood of free nations.

Did not Napoleon make this statement: "The first sovereign to embrace in good faith the cause of nationalities would at once hold sway over Europe and accomplish anything he might desire?" Did not Napoleon follow that policy with regard to the Poles in the establishment of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw? As I take it, the true principle of a league of nations means the protection of smaller nationalities. Although the great powers will gather certain advantages thereby, inasmuch as the League of Nations will be conducive to the reduction of armaments, it nevertheless remains true that they shall keep against the whole world the unassailable right of protecting themselves against the other powers by continuing the manufacture of arma-