

are very deplorable. I may say that the gentlemen who made this report were rather conservative in type, well-known trades unionists, and one may not be afraid of being accused of being very disloyal to the Empire when we remember that Ramsay MacDonald and the members of the British Labour party advocated closer relationship with Russia. In making this plea to-night I am but carrying out the avowed policy of the Labour party of Britain. The following is the considered conclusion of the delegates who spent some time in Russia:

Finally the delegation is of opinion that the Soviet system of representation and its scheme of constitutional and civil rights, so far from being undemocratic in the widest sense of the word, given in many respects to the individual a more real and reasonable opportunity of participation in public affairs than does parliamentary and party government. . . .

Under that constitution there are certainly as great--and possibly greater--possibilities than elsewhere in respect of popular government, political peace, and social progress.

And again with regard to the general social conditions that exist the delegates state:

The conclusion reached by the delegation in the matter of law and order is that public order is now on a footing well above that in most continental countries; that justice is equitably enforced in the new courts, and under new codes that constitute a judicial system still in its youth, but adequate for its present purpose.

And then in conclusion, after presenting a vast amount of statistical data, very carefully prepared, these delegates sum up in a paragraph their general impression:

Final Conclusion to General and Labour Reports

In view of the information contained in the preceding chapters—all of which has been obtained by themselves from sources and through channels that convince them as to its general accuracy—the delegation has come to the following conclusions. That the U.S.S.R. is a strong and stable state; that its government is based firstly on a system of state socialism that has the active support of a large majority of the workers and the acceptance of an equally large majority of the peasants and, secondly, on a federal structure that gives very full cultural and very fair political liberties to racial and regional minorities, together with full religious toleration; that the machinery of government though fundamentally different from that of other states seems to work well, and that the government it gives is not only in every way better than anything that Russia has ever yet had, but that it has done and is doing work in which other older state systems have failed and are still failing; that these good results have reconciled all but a very small minority to renouncing rights of opposition that are essential to political liberty elsewhere; and that this causes no resistance partly because these rights have been replaced by others of greater value under the Soviet system, and partly because recent movements have been steadily towards their restoration; and finally that the whole constitutes a new departure of the greatest interest that is well worth foreign study and a new development that may be greatly benefited by foreign assistance.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

This report is signed by the following well-known Labour men of Great Britain:

Herbert Smith, Ben Tillett, John Turner, John Bromely, Alan Findlay, Albert Purcell (Chairman), Fred Bramley (Secretary), and Harold Grenfell, A. R. McDonell, George Young, Advisory Delegates.

Now without going further into the situation in Russia, I would urge that we should take our part together with other forward-looking nations, and together with the progressive sections of our own Empire in asking that the league should include in the near future, not merely the allied nations, but all the nations of the world, as was the original intention. It is only on that basis the league can be made effective. Again, I would urge that the league must be democratic in its organization. The assembly at the present time represents some fifty nations and the council represents four great powers and six other countries. This means that the council composed so largely of the great nations is able to impose its will on the assembly. I cannot think that is in accordance with the general principles of democracy, and undoubtedly it is this weakness that has led to the failures referred to in the article read by the hon. member for West Calgary. Why should we urge that disputes should be brought before the league and then refuse in many instances to refer disputes with which as an empire we are closely connected? I need not go further than to refer to the Egyptian situation, but there are many others. Why should we set up a league that is supposed to preserve peace, which we proclaim to the world ought to adjudicate in cases of dispute, and then reserve to ourselves the right to withdraw certain cases from the jurisdiction of the league?

One other point. There is a very great danger that the league should become little more than a tool of the great international financiers. In connection with the Dawes report, I am sure that many hon. members recall the words of Lloyd George who stated that the report was the work not of Mr. MacDonald, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, or of Monsieur Herriot, Premier of France, but that essentially that report was the work of the international financiers. Surely such a statement coming from such a source ought to give us all pause. Further than that we have been frequently told of the great benefit which has been conferred upon Austria and Hungary by the loans which have been made to those countries. I think perhaps the true situation might be very well indicated by the following paragraph from