

ment for maintaining peace. Europe had reverted to open power politics, to dominance by the great powers. There is and will remain a divergence of views as to the responsibility for that situation. I am inclined to agree with the judgment of the Marquess of Crewe, in a recent speech in London:

The League of Nations has been blamed, and the nations who were supposed to be able to direct the policy of the League of Nations were individually blamed, for not having taken strong action against aggressors on one or two occasions, but I am inclined to think that posterity will be disposed to blame the League of Nations infinitely more for having devoted attention almost exclusively to the penalties it could exact from those that made war rather than giving time and attention to removing the causes for which war is made. That is to say, article 16, the penalties article, was so to speak, perpetually on the agenda of the League, although, as we know, it was not brought into play in the way many people wished, whereas article 19 remained in a dusty pigeonhole. I cannot help feeling that the present situation might have been entirely different if a different course had been taken. It might even have happened that the name of Herr Hitler would never have been heard, because the occasions which brought him into such prominence as the recreator of his country never need have arisen.

But because the league failed in this high task of world control to which it was prematurely set, it does not follow that it has failed completely. The conception of the peoples of the world sitting in council together to achieve their common interests and solve their current problems is too splendid, too indispensable in this jostling world, to be allowed to die. In the anarchy and passion of to-day, such a centre of co-ordination, such a focus of good-will, is more needed than ever. It will have to operate on a more limited and less spectacular stage, building up its technical and social and economic activities, accustoming peoples and governments to work together, until eventually they may find it possible to use this tried and tested instrument for greater ends.

In this connection it is of special interest to observe a note which the United States government sent to the secretary general of the League of Nations last month:

The league has been responsible for the development of mutual exchange and discussion of ideas and methods to a greater extent, and in more fields of humanitarian and scientific endeavour, than any other organization in history. The United States government are keenly aware of the value of this type of general interchange, and desire to see it extended.

Encouraging as has been the progress already made, much remains to be done for the promotion of human welfare in health, social, economic, and financial fields. . . .

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

The United States government look forward to the development and expansion of the league's machinery for dealing with the problems in these fields, and to the participation by all nations in active efforts to solve them. . . . They will continue to collaborate in those activities and will consider, in a sympathetic spirit, means of making their collaboration more effective.

A deeper interest and a vital factor in the determining of Canadian policies is our concern for the strength and welfare of the United Kingdom. It has its foundation in ties of kinship and personal contact. It is probably true that, for most people, as years pass, the centre of political gravity tends to shift from the land of their fathers to the land of their children. Probably most of those of us whose ancestors came from the British Isles stand midway in this respect between our French-speaking fellow-citizens whose ancestors have been established here for three hundred years, and newer comers who, in some instances, naturally think still in terms of the life and ways of the land they have left. But the feeling of personal interest on the part of Canadians generally in what is affectionately termed the old country is still a very strong and determining factor.

It is, of course, not the only reason why the fate of Britain gives us special concern. Ties of trade are strong. Still stronger is the admiration, which is not confined to those of British ancestry, for what Britain is and what she has given the world, the free institutions she has developed, the tolerance and ability to reconcile opposing points of view which mark her political life, the insistence upon individual liberty, the devotion to public duty and the readiness to do public service without regimentation or reward.

In times like these there is a special recognition of the fact that Great Britain, to-day, whatever may have been the case in the past, has no territorial ambitions, no designs on any other people's land or liberty, and that her influence is the main force in the world for maintaining peace. A world in which Britain was weak would be greatly worse for small countries than a world in which she was strong. Finally there are the historical and political ties—the allegiance to the same king; the common human interest in the holders of the crown; the free association in the same commonwealth. With Britain's strength is also associated a sense of our own security. Particularly at a time like the present, where there are evidences of a desire of world domination by force, have we reason to feel that an act of an aggressor aimed at the destruction of Britain would constitute a menace to the freedom of every nation of the British commonwealth. All these forces com-