

national agreements of one sort and another. I draw the attention of honourable members to these points. If we are to be neutral, we must continue to trade with the King's enemies on equal terms. That is to say, if on the second or third or fourth day of the month an enemy merchant ship and a British merchant ship enter the harbour of Halifax or Saint John for the purpose of taking on cargo, we will say, of nickel, asbestos, copper, rubber, and so forth, our Government must see to it that we treat both those ships equally. Under a policy of neutrality, if we give one ship a cargo we must give the other one also; otherwise we are not neutral. Then we must enforce the rules of neutrality equally against British and other warships. Suppose a British warship of inferior strength takes refuge in the harbour of Halifax, and a belligerent warship of superior strength is waiting outside. At the end of twenty-four hours we must drive that British warship out to sea to almost certain destruction. That is international law on the subject of neutrality. Then we must provide that no one shall leave this country for the purpose of enlisting in the forces of the King in his right as King of Great Britain; and probably our recently introduced Foreign Enlistment Bill will be invoked for the purpose. Those are some of the incidents of international law.

Let us consider those three points. Under a policy of neutrality we should be compelled to give the King's enemies these valuable cargoes of nickel, and so on, or lay ourselves open to the charge of not being neutral; we should be compelled to drive a British warship of inferior strength out to sea to almost certain destruction; we should have to enforce a Foreign Enlistment Act with respect to those of our nationals who might wish to join the King's forces elsewhere. If we want to start civil war in Canada we can go about it in no better way than by attempting to enforce neutrality in this country in the event of Great Britain being at war. Someone may wish to discuss the question of Canada seceding from the British Empire, which would be a more honest course for this country to pursue than to remain in the Empire under these conditions of limited liability. I do not think we need discuss secession.

If secession is not feasible, and neutrality is also impossible, what course remains? I submit there remains only the policy of full co-operation with the British Empire in matters of defence, or, as I put it, collective security within the Empire. We have heard some objection to such a policy. We are constantly referring to our sovereign status when it suits

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH.

us, and departing from that position when it does not. But at this point some persons say, "We are a sovereign state and must retain control of our foreign affairs, and it would be very improper for us to relinquish that control, as collective security within the Empire would probably require." They talk about the "national conscience," which must not be impaired by our permitting any others to speak for Canada, and they add, "If you engage in collective security within the Empire, it follows that Canada may be plunged into an aggressive, imperialistic and unjust war." That always amuses me, because the very same persons who find so much difficulty in Imperial co-operation in time of war have again and again declared their willingness to embark on a policy of collective security within the League of Nations, and to entrust this tender national conscience of ours to the management and control of the League Council, consisting largely of foreigners, many of whom have not even paid their dues for the support of the League. I put that aside. I never was very strongly in favour of the League of Nations, and I have no reason to believe that collective security within the League would be of much benefit to this country. I am prepared to bet my money on collective security within the British Empire. I say that because from the point of view of efficiency and effectiveness and value it far exceeds in terms of security anything that the League of Nations can offer us.

Just on that point I should like to read a statement made by the Prime Minister. I am now dealing with the question of linking up closely with Great Britain for the purpose of collective security and national defence, and with the objection that if we follow such a course we shall find ourselves being plunged into wars in Europe—imperialistic wars, aggressive wars, unjust wars. At page 276 of Hansard of this year the Prime Minister says:

We have need for unity as between all parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations. I for one believe that the British Commonwealth to-day is exercising a greater influence for peace than any other force in the world. For my part, instead of talking about the danger of Britain dragging us into war, I would say that I think there is not a man living in England to-day who wants war. I believe that the entire British nation—working men, professional men, public men, all classes—are determined to exercise their powers to the last degree to avert a great world catastrophe and to prevent, if possible, a war into which Britain may be drawn.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH:

What Britain has done to appease antagonisms in the last few years is something that the rest of the world hardly begins to appre-