

What I am now about to say will not be said in a critical way. Russia's attitude was very refreshing. Apparently she had not learned—perhaps it was to her advantage, and it may prove eventually to be of advantage to the world—that the niceties of what we call “old world diplomacy” were a thing of the past. Perhaps that is stressed too greatly at times. But we must envisage the situation as Russia saw it. When we speak of Russia and China we must remember that a few days prior to the peace with Japan the western powers were perhaps astonished that Russia was taking part in the war with Japan. Why? Because we had in the back of our minds the thought that Russia might go too far on account of the internal situation between Chiang Kai-shek and the north-eastern provinces of China where communism was predominant. We were afraid that Stalin and Russia would play into the hands of the Chinese communists and take this opportunity for territorial aggrandizement at the expense of China. One of the finest and most refreshing things that we have seen since the beginning of the war is this: Mr. Stalin, or the Soviet republics, practically repudiated communism in China. They gave a free hand, *carte blanche*, to Chiang Kai-shek so far as China was concerned. We were afraid that the fine Russian army would be occupying Manchuria and part of China, that it would be much easier for them to advance than the allies and that they would remain there permanently. They never had that in their mind. They made a statement at the time that they were not out for aggrandizement so far as Chinese territory was concerned, and to-day and yesterday we had the magnificent spectacle of the Russian army evacuating Manchuria and leaving the soil of China practically to its full integrity. I want to repeat these things. In many ways Russia has given an example to the whole world, in international diplomacy at least. Sometimes we have been worried; we have been kept uneasy. It has been impossible to understand the full import of their action. But we must recognize the tangible things. We must recognize what has really happened since the beginning of the war. The Russian people have been true to the allied governments. I must pay tribute to the Russian government for that marvellous stroke toward the peace of the world in their withdrawing from Manchuria and returning that integral part of China to the Chinese people, after safeguarding certain essential interests.

Now we have a new charter and a new organization to replace the league of nations or is it a new covenant. I should like to say just a word about the old league. It was just

as good and just as bad as the signatories to the covenant intended to make it. There has been a great deal of criticism levelled at the league of nations, but as an organization, as a unit for the welfare of the peoples of the world, it was perfect in itself. You need only read its constitution to realize that if everything implied therein had been put into effect we would not have had a war five or six years ago. However, the great powers belonging to the league were not always in agreement; they were not always ready to do their utmost to make it succeed. It is impossible for the whole to function unless it has the loyal support of all the components. There should have been no mental reservations in connection with the old league of nations, and I want to express the hope that there will be no mental reservations as far as the new covenant is concerned. Surely we have learned our lesson from the past. If the powers, great and small, who have signed this covenant are not behind it heart and soul, if they are not ready to give the best that is within them to bring about the full implementation of the covenant, it will be a failure just as the old league of nations was a failure.

What was the cause of the failure of the Geneva league? First, there was the intransigence of France. I am not going to accuse France of all the things she has been accused of. Immediately after the last war the allies who had fought with her for democracy, for freedom, to crush the huns, left France alone and within a few short years she was marked as the bad actor of the play, and this by her previous friends. She was called militaristic; she was said to be not a friend of freedom and democracy. That was why France showed some impatience and petulance in connection with the old Geneva league. The same thing applies to Japan. Her aggressiveness was one of the principal causes of the deterioration of the league of nations. When Japan defiled Manchuria and unjustly attacked China I knew it was the beginning of the end for the league of nations. The same applies to the unwillingness of Italy to obey the covenant. When the nations of the world who belonged to the league of nations allowed Italy dastardly and brutally to attack and conquer Ethiopia, we knew that within a short period the league of nations, with all its fine ideals and attainments would be doomed. The same would apply, and I say it in all sincerity, to the lukewarmness and hesitancy of Great Britain. Each of the great nations must take its share of the responsibility for at least some of the failures of the league of nations. We must include also the

[Mr. Bradette.]