

other metals and minerals from Canada to destinations outside the British empire and the western hemisphere have been kept within the limits of our normal peace-time trade with the other countries concerned.

The formation of the triple axis has, without doubt, contributed to international tension, particularly in the far east. It has not, however, served either to intimidate the United States, or to isolate Britain. Indeed, its effect has been the exact opposite. There has been a marked stiffening of policies both of the United States and of Britain in the far east, and an intensification of sentiment in the United States in support of aid for Britain.

I have endeavoured to review the developments on the international scene since the adjournment of the house in midsummer. I wish now to say something of their significance—of what they reveal of the designs of the enemy. The events of the past few months make it clearer than ever that the immediate aim of Germany is a new world order, based upon spheres of influence to be controlled by nazi Germany and her axis partners. Hitler plans, by holding out specious hopes of collaboration, to secure the participation of the subject peoples in the elaboration of his grand design. This is the subtle method by which he is supplementing aggression in his effort to achieve world domination.

Nazi intrigue and the deceptive cloak of collaboration fail, however, to conceal the underlying tyranny of force and fear on which the structure of the new order is to rest. It becomes more apparent, with each new development, that we are engaged in a titanic and terrible death struggle between two conflicting philosophies of life. On the one side is tyranny; on the other, democracy. On the one side, brutality and slavery; on the other, humanity and freedom. On the one side, the law of force; on the other, the force of law.

I should like to recall to the house the words I used in this place, on September 8, 1939, at the outset of this struggle which many still regarded as no more than another European war. These were my words:

No, Mr. Speaker, the ambition of this dictator is not Poland. At one time he said it was only the areas in which there were German-speaking people. But we have seen that ambition grow. That may have been the thought in his mind some years ago, but we all know how ambition feeds upon itself; we all know how the lust for power blinds men's senses to all else. We know where and how he started, first with the militarization of the Rhineland. He then said—I quote Hitler's own words—he had no thought of annexing Austria. After giving his word that there

would be no further attempt at conquest, he took Czechoslovakia. Then he took Moravia and Bohemia, then Memel, now Danzig and Poland. Where is he creeping to? Into those communities of the north, some of which to-day say they are going to remain neutral. I tell them if they remain neutral in this struggle, and Britain and France go down, there is not one of them that will bear for long the name that it bears at the present time; not one of them. And if this conquerer by his methods of force, violence and terror, and other ruthless iniquities is able to crush the peoples of Europe, what is going to become of the doctrine of isolation of this North American continent? If Britain goes down, if France goes down, the whole business of isolation will prove to have been a mere myth. There will in time be no freedom on this continent; there will in time be no liberty. Life will not be worth living. It is for all of us on this continent to do our part to save its privileged position by helping others.

That does not sound, Mr. Speaker, very much like trying to lull and soothe the Canadian people into a sense of security. And that statement was made in this house on the 8th of September last year.

At the close of the last war, there was an attempt to build up a genuine world order based on international law and international justice. The democratic nations tried, with many failures, with many weaknesses, and, perhaps at times, with too little conviction, to maintain the relations between nations on a basis of respect for the pledged word and the solemn covenant. They may, on occasion, have failed to grasp opportunities for reconciliation, but there can be no doubt of their genuine desire for the preservation of peace.

Unhappily, love of peace and respect for justice were not shared by all nations, or, at least, not by all governments. From the Japanese attack on Manchuria in 1931 to the nazi attack on Poland in 1939, the world witnessed a steady progression of successful acts of aggression. Each of the aggressor nations has, in turn, through withdrawal from the League of Nations, expressed open contempt for the condemnation of world opinion, for the principles of international law and for the rights of other nations.

From the moment that Hitler achieved power in Germany, the tempo of aggression increased. Germany herself began to rearm. In 1934, through the murder of Dollfus, she began to undermine the independence of Austria. In 1935, Italy attacked Ethiopia. Germany took advantage of the Ethiopian crisis to remilitarize the Rhineland. In 1936, the civil war broke out in Spain. Immediately the totalitarian powers began their sinister intervention in that struggle. In 1937 the present conflict between Japan and China began at the moment when the Spanish civil