

Australia, addressing an organization there, I said that from our failure in the past we should now proceed to success in the future, and that nothing is a greater incentive to success than failure, properly understood.

I wonder sometimes if we do take time to look back to 1919 and 1920. I have little doubt that the Dominion of Canada would not have been a member of the League of Nations, that Great Britain would not have been a member of the League of Nations, had it not been that the league was largely promoted by the United States of America. We ought to face that fact. It was the President of the United States who asked Colonel House to prepare the first draft of the league covenant, and those of you who have looked through the last Life of General Smuts will see, in the appendix, the part that he took in the modification of the original draft.

That covenant, dealing with the League of Nations, as it was ultimately incorporated in the Treaty of Versailles, was so incorporated at the instance of the United States of America, and it must not be forgotten that when this great western republic became a party to the League of Nations it was with the greatest joy and satisfaction that the old countries, England and France, and the newer republics on the American continent, as well as those countries in various parts of the world that were not republics, such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada, viewed this as the first great world effort to obtain collective security. And it must not be forgotten that the first assembly of the League of Nations was called and opened by the president of the United States of America.

When the United States senate rejected the Treaty of Versailles, and with it the covenant, of course you had a new condition, and the league itself had to face a situation such as no new organization, the machinery of which had just been set in motion, ever had to face before. If it has failed it has failed gloriously with respect to many matters, because in the interim, unsupported, as I have said, by those who, more than anyone else, were responsible for giving it birth in the first instance, it managed to discharge such duties as it did discharge. Therefore I think there is no reason why on some re-organized plan the world might not still declare its determination that there should be peace amongst the democracies of Christendom, and we might still be able, by effecting collective security, to ensure the peaceful development of the nations of the world. I believe so. I have not yet become so great a pessimist as to believe that the league, which

[Mr. Bennett.]

for a period of sixteen years, handicapped as it was from its very inception, has been able to do what it has done, may not now be able under the conditions that obtain throughout the world to forge an instrument for collective security that will enable men to devote their time, energies and incomes to the peaceful development of their countries. And, Mr. Speaker, I do still believe in a league of nations for that end. I never was one of those who warmly applauded the League of Nations after the United States defeated the peace treaties and the league covenants. I confess at once that to me it was a matter of the gravest concern, and I felt that it would be extremely doubtful whether the league could hope to function successfully. But England and France held on, with most of the other nations of the world. Germany came and went; Japan left; some of the nations of South America left, but the league still endeavoured to function, within a very limited area.

I believe that the committee now dealing with the matter, on which committee Canada is represented, with the support of Canadians and other members of the British commonwealth of nations, believing as they do in national security brought about through collective effort and cooperation, may be able to set up some instrument so that men will be devising not methods and means of destruction but rather methods and means looking to the peaceful development of their respective countries.

I am one of those who, out of office, rejoice in the prosperity of our country. I should say to my hon. friends from Essex West and Gloucester that the prosperity of Canada, like that of other nations of the world, is a prosperity which began in 1934 and which continued during that year. It improved in 1935 and greatly improved in 1936, but relatively the improvement in 1935 over that of 1934 was not substantially different from the improvement in 1936 over that of 1935. The statistical references indicate that Canada's position is one of the foremost, though not by any means the first, and that we have kept pace with the other nations of the world in the improvement that is everywhere apparent. Our trade has expanded. To the extent to which we have made it easier for other countries to sell goods in Canada, imports from abroad thus have been stimulated by governmental activity. To the extent to which other countries have made it possible for our goods to find markets there, the action of other governments has contributed to the end in question. But it is idle to say that the action of any government is responsible