

sary to the production of war supplies, on Canada's part alone, would not achieve the ends proposed.

As to concerted action for that purpose, there is no present prospect of such a policy being adopted. No proposal for an embargo either on munitions or on war materials was made either by the league assembly or by the Brussels conference. No country has placed an embargo on shipments to Japan or to China. In the circumstances it would appear there is nothing in Canada's position which would make isolated action on our part either necessary or effective. It has been stated that New Zealand has placed an embargo on exports to Japan. This is not correct. Last year a New Zealand labour union refused to load scrap-iron on a vessel sailing to Japan. The New Zealand government induced the union to abandon this action. Later, the government prohibited the export of scrap-iron to any country. No embargo has been imposed on the export of wool or any other commodity to any country.

I have spoken of the conflict in the orient and of the civil war in Spain. But Spain is not the only troubled area in Europe. There are few countries on the continent that are not undergoing a social and political revolution. In some, the revolutionary forces of the left or of the right have already attained power more autocratic than the regimes they have displaced; in others, the struggle still continues; and even in those countries that still seek progress by ordered freedom, the repercussions of the upheavals elsewhere spread fear and confusion. No country, however distant and however preoccupied by its own problems, can be unconcerned with the revival of violence, intolerance and disregard of the rights of weaker states. To countries in the whirlpool or on its verge the situation is particularly disturbing and of overwhelming import. It is not surprising that in democracies such as Britain and France the imminence of these threats to national and social and individual security, and the close association and sympathy of groups in each country with one or other of the forces and theories warring in central and eastern Europe, have led to a wide and violent conflict of opinion as to the policy that should be adopted to meet these new conditions. There are many shades and variations of opinion, but two main tendencies have developed.

In the opinion of one group, Armageddon has already come, the forces of light and darkness are irrevocably swinging into battle line for the final test of destiny. Europe and liberty, it is contended, can be saved only if the democracies firmly and unitedly call a

halt here and now. The other widespread attitude is to recognize the situation as dangerous, but to insist that the policy of dividing Europe or the world into two antagonistic camps, organizing a holy alliance against fascism, would be still more dangerous, and is neither possible nor necessary. There is no warrant, it is urged, for fighting a preventive war or for seeking to form a hard and fast alliance against the authoritarian states. If such an alliance could be formed, it would only drive the fascist countries into firmer alliance and put any possibility of peaceful settlement out of the question. The wiser policy, it is urged, is to try to bring all Europe back to sanity, to emphasize and strengthen the points of agreement, not of difference, to seek to adjust each specific difficulty in turn. In what I have just been saying I am not stating my own views, I am stating the views which I believe are contending against each other in Europe to-day.

I am sure that every government in Great Britain since the war, and certainly not least the present government, has striven for peace. Differences of opinion may exist as to the wisdom of the policies adopted toward that end at different times. Governments may have failed to appreciate the strength and trend of changing forces, but taken broadly they have shown a realism and a patience that few if any other countries can equal.

I do not consider we are called upon to pass judgment or to take sides in United Kingdom discussions. Inevitably the rise of such contentious issues, such party cleavages, lead to efforts to secure or to claim the support of Canada or Australia or South Africa or New Zealand for one or other view. Statements appear in the British press that the dominions demand this or that, that Australia supports the government or that New Zealand supports the opposition view. So far as the Canadian government is concerned, it does not consider that it is in the interest either of Canada or of the commonwealth to tender advice as to what policy the United Kingdom should adopt week by week, or become involved in British political disputes. We have expressed no opinion on that policy, and no one in London is authorized or warranted in interpreting us as doing so.

Incidentally, may I say that the time has come to cease speaking of "the dominions" as if they were some peculiar half-fledged type of community, and all alike in their interests and views. Such a usage leads to confusion at best, and to alibis and misrepresentation at worst. South Africa is South Africa, New Zealand is New Zealand, Australia is Australia and Can-