

titled to have it. I believe they will expand that zone right to the shores of Japan, and in my opinion, in doing so, they will help safeguard the future peace of the world. However, in connection with these zones of influence there is a certain amount of danger to other nations, and the question necessarily must come into the open. It is no use leaving these skeletons in the closet; they will come out eventually and the sooner we will face them the better for all concerned. Public opinion, which is not the same as it was in previous years, which is more alert, more enlightened, will not tolerate some of the things that took place in connection with the treaty of Versailles. How often, right in these precincts, were we told before the war that the great cause of discontent and disunion in Europe, the causes of the last war, was the treaty of Versailles? Let us build better now than we built then. Surely nations, like individuals, must learn from the sad and terrible experiences through which we have gone. These great powers, I believe, have the right to these zones of influence and also to what might be called satellite states. That has been almost consecrated as a principle, and it will be absolutely impossible to get away from it at the peace conference. But we must have safeguards as far as these zones are concerned. If we do not try to establish those safeguards or mandates now, they will be forgotten and passed over, and these matters will continue to fester after the peace has been signed, and may be the cause of new wars.

I should like to say one word in passing on the attitude of Great Britain and France with regard to subject territory, and again I do not say this in a critical way, because I believe the same principles apply to the United States and Russia. Here we have involved 750,000,000 coloured people in the world. At the San Francisco conference it was stated that eventually they will have self-government, but certainly not in the immediate future. I am not in a position nor have I any right to blame these nations for what has occurred in the past, but again we must face the facts. We see what is happening at the present time in Indo-China, the Dutch possessions, and other parts of the world. You cannot for all time keep 750,000,000 people in subjection. I sincerely appreciate what the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart said this afternoon in regard to an Indian politician or statesman—

Mr. COLDWELL: A statesman.

Mr. BRADETTE: —who, he said, could compare with any of the experienced statesmen they had at San Francisco. These are matters we must keep in mind, we of the

[Mr. Bradette.]

Canadian parliament and the Canadian nation. I am telling this house what is in the minds of my own people: miners working in the mines, lumbermen working in the forests of northern Ontario, farmers and settlers in the clay belt of the north, professional men—in a word all class of people. I am expressing their sentiments, aspirations and hopes, and also their fears in connection with the next peace conference. The old idea of colonialism naturally is repugnant to the Canadian people. Anyone who called a Canadian a colonial would arouse a terrific reaction immediately. In our own minds we believe that this principle should disappear throughout the world, that all the people should govern themselves. I do not go so far as to say that perhaps any small nations or group of people—and no one has the right to refer to them as backward nations—should be under the guidance of bigger nations. It might be necessary for a time under certain conditions. A small nation might be under mandate for a certain number of years. They might be under mandate for their own natural and physical protection. But we have forgotten our promises of freedom to them at these conferences, and we tried to forget it at the San Francisco conference. We have blinded ourselves to the situation, one which is bound to face us sooner or later, and which carries with it great responsibilities.

Another feature was this, that regardless of the hope we had early in the war and during the conflict, the major powers want to retain what has been traditionally theirs. It was shown again at San Francisco that the tradition of the past is to be maintained. That was shown all along the line. We saw clear evidence of the fact, the deep-rooted fact, that powerful nations never disgorge except as they are defeated. It displayed the worst side of the mentality of the great, who cannot learn to recede in time.

I know those are hard words, but they must be uttered. I do not make these statements with pleasure, but I know the facts are there. I know that millions of lives have been sacrificed, and that the weary world has been going through turmoil—and almost near death in the last five years. The nations, whether big or small, should now be willing to make sacrifices for the good of the whole of the civilized world. Jealousy, fear and long established habits prevailed in large measure. The great powers quarrelled over irrelevancies. In Great Britain and in Canadian newspapers were big headlines, and we were afraid that the soviet representatives would wreck the conference, that they would leave it.