

century. The conquests of Alexander, in comparison, fade almost into insignificance, and the Roman Empire itself, even at the zenith of its power, never reached the stature of the British colossus. We are self-sufficient and can do without the rest of the universe."

Is that quite true? Besides, is it desirable that we should form a separate group in the world? That we should shut ourselves up, as Joseph Chamberlain would say, in "splendid isolation"?

I do not think so, and the Empire delegates did not think so. The *vae soli* applies to nations as well as to individuals. The man who lives alone, and only for himself, is a bear among men; the nation that isolates itself is regarded with suspicion by other nations.

This was perfectly well understood by the delegates at the Ottawa Conference. Great Britain and her daughter nations were united not in a spirit of defiance or of provocation, but, on the contrary, in a spirit of world fraternity. Not a word was uttered that might give offence to anyone.

In the face of a world bristling with customs barriers we desire simply to protect ourselves.

From a higher point of view, might not this protection, however legitimate, have some objectionable features? For in raising fiscal barriers against some, and lowering them for others, we are in the final instance but increasing the number of international barricades erected throughout the world.

The Ottawa Conference aimed farther and higher. It invited other nations to enlarge the scope of the British Zollverein until it should embrace the universe. We are isolating ourselves only temporarily, for five years. It is an experiment we are making. If it succeeds, other nations will have but to follow our example. We shall gladly join with them and there will then be a real advance towards universal understanding.

Can you not see what such an understanding could accomplish for world peace?

We have, it is true, the League of Nations. But the League of Nations aims rather at disarmament and the prevention or restriction of hostilities. It does not reach the fundamental causes of war. Now, these causes, or at least many of them, have changed since the advent of world democracy. Formerly the ambition of a sovereign prince, the glory of conquest, the alteration of the Ems telegram, the whim of a court favourite, sufficed to throw nations into armed conflict.

It is said—and it seems true—that it was because of a visit that the cunning Disraeli had Queen Victoria pay to "her cousin" the Empress Eugenie, newly placed on the im-

Hon. Mr. POIRIER.

perial throne, that France joined with England in the military expedition to the Crimea, with which she had nothing to do.

Of the old causes of war there remain scarcely more than one, the desire of territorial aggrandizement. Democracy has caused most of the others to disappear. But it has given rise to a new cause—commercial exchange. Capital to-day is the absolute monarch of other days. Nations seek to enrich themselves at the expense of other nations. This is the spirit which must be fought. The ultimate result of the Imperial Economic Conference will be to combat such a spirit. When the nations shall have reached an understanding with one another with regard to their trade relations, the height of the fiscal barriers to be raised between them, and the method of interchange, the most profound causes of armed conflict will have disappeared. The League of Nations will then no longer have much reason to exist.

The Ottawa Conference is an invitation to the rest of the world to work out a method of commercial exchange applicable to all nations. Here, perhaps, may be found the solution of the great problem of universal peace. Canada in that case—for it was upon the invitation of our Prime Minister that the British nations assembled in Ottawa in August last—Canada will have been a precursor.

What leads one to believe this is the fact that several nations have already awakened to the idea of enlarging the circle described at Ottawa by the representatives of the British Empire—enlarging it, peacefully, until it embraces the world. There is soon to be a universal conference in London, and there is every reason to believe that our example will be followed.

The speech of His Excellency alludes to several other very important subjects to be studied—the railways, redistribution of electoral districts, the banks, the St. Lawrence Waterway. I will not touch upon those subjects, feeling that I have already tried your patience long enough. Besides, they will not come before the two Houses of Parliament until after the resumption of the session in the new year.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD: Honourable members of the Senate, in rising to second the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I would ask the indulgence of my fellow senators while I make some reference to matters contained in the Speech. Before doing so, permit me to express my great appreciation of being associated with the mover of the Address. His long political service has been of great advantage to his