

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Carried unanimously.

Mr. MANION: I shall have to get serious again, because this is rather a serious question. This afternoon it seemed to me that the Prime Minister attempted to argue that parliament could decide as to our neutrality. I do not think parliament has any power to decide that question. I repeat, the enemy will decide it if Great Britain is at war.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said I thought the enemy would decide it.

Mr. MANION: Then the Prime Minister and I are on quite the same ground. I thought the Prime Minister argued a little differently this afternoon, but I probably misunderstood him.

Mr. STEVENS: He argued both ways.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens) suggests that the Prime Minister left a couple of doors open by which he might leave. I do not want to get off my thought.

If I were to go outside the House of Commons, I might quote Professor W. P. M. Kennedy, of the university of Toronto. His Constitution of Canada has been quoted before in this house. He is considered one of the best constitutional authorities in this country, and I should like to quote from page 452 of that book:

Once the imperial government declares war, Canada is at war, and once a foreign state declares war against Great Britain, Canada is at war. In either case, Canada need not fight, need not supply a man or a ship or assist in any way. Canada might be prepared to preserve the most meticulous neutrality, but as international law now stands, Canada would be at war, and its territory and citizens liable to attack.

And at page 540 he says:

It remains as true in 1937 as it did in 1914 that when the crown is at war, Canada is legally at war.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Who is the author?

Mr. MANION: W. P. M. Kennedy, professor of law, university of Toronto.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I knew him well.

Mr. MANION: He and Mr. Schlosberg wrote another book on the constitution of South Africa, and I quote from page 484 as follows:

With regard to the right of a dominion to remain neutral while the rest of the empire is at war, it is sufficient to state that when the king declares war, all his territories and

[Mr. Manion.]

dominions are at war. There is no recognition of the divisibility of the legal position of the king.

General Jan Smuts took the same position, namely, that the crown is not divisible. I repeat that those who feel there should be neutrality should come out frankly and declare for independence. I have another quotation here which appeals to me a great deal because it comes from a part of the empire which in a sense has declared its independence. Prime Minister Eamon de Valera of the Irish Free State, now called Eire, declared, according to a dispatch dated February 17, a little over six weeks ago, that "Eire could not remain neutral in a war between Great Britain and another state." He went on to say:

In the event of a war, it is essential for the economic position of Eire that she should continue her trade with England in cattle and other products. That would undoubtedly be taken to put us in a position of combatants by any nation at war with England, who would think it a vital part of its campaign to prevent food from reaching England.

He goes on:

Its object would then be to bomb our ports and make it impossible for us to carry on our trade. It is to defend our territory against such possible attack that we consider it advisable to bring in increased estimates for defence.

Surely Canada is in exactly the same position as the Irish Free State as to shipping and as to trade, as to supplies of food and as to the possibilities of being attacked.

Then what would we have to do if we were neutral? There are certain duties which devolve upon a neutral by international law, which duties would naturally devolve upon us. I am going to mention three or four of them, and I submit that not one could be carried out by Canada in her dealings with Great Britain if Great Britain were at war and Canada remained neutral. For instance, we could not supply munitions or food as referred to by Mr. de Valera in the quotation I have just given. An enemy would do his best to prevent any food from going to Great Britain, because no country in the world is so vulnerable as Great Britain as to its food supply. Great Britain cannot keep sufficient food supplies on hand to last any great length of time. That was the attempt made in the last war by German submarines, to starve out Great Britain, and if they could have prevented for a period of three weeks ships from entering the ports of Great Britain they would probably have succeeded.

Second, if a British ship, pursued by a powerful enemy fleet, took refuge in Halifax