

question and provide immediately for the defence of our harbours and our coasts, in order that we may be in a position to export our produce to Great Britain in time of war. If we fail to do that, if for any reason this enormous sea-borne trade is blocked or stopped, this country, and in particular the West, will be ruined. During the past few years we in the West have had experience of what results when prices fall very low. What would happen to the West if the whole of our grain production had to be stored in elevators or along railway sidings?

I think we should go further than protecting our own harbours and coast-lines. We should provide ourselves with a sufficient fleet actually to convoy our wheat and other food stuffs to the British Isles. I think we owe that to ourselves if we are to maintain our dignity and our self-respect.

If we do not do that, then we have to face another situation altogether. The Argentine Republic trades naturally with Great Britain. I say naturally, because it has no manufacturing industries and is able to dispose of the whole of its export trade, which is grain and beef, and take in payment therefor manufactured goods. My attention has been drawn to that by many incidents, and a few years ago I examined the composition of the fleet of the Argentine Republic. I find that it has provided itself with a defensive fleet, consisting of coast-defence battleships, submarines, airplanes and river steamers and the like, but in addition a fleet designed for convoy duty. I make this prediction. In the next war the Argentine Republic will send in its own ships the produce of its fields and ranches, and will convoy them to Great Britain. Unless we adopt some suitable measures we shall find the market which we have in Great Britain for these very products, and which last year amounted to \$523,000,000 odd, will be taken over by the Argentine Republic.

As I have said, we enjoy this trade under preferential agreements. We have asked Great Britain to take certain chances under these agreements. We have said plainly, "We know that in favouring our agricultural production some harm is being done to British agriculture, and we are sending our production to supplement your own."

It is true that this trade agreement and those that preceded it were not negotiated on the basis of war. But I submit that they were not negotiated on the basis that if there should be an outbreak of war we should leave the Empire or place ourselves in the position of being unable to carry out our implied undertaking.

There has been some discussion throughout the country as to what our position would be in the event of war in which Great Britain was involved. It has been urged that we should declare our neutrality. That question has been discussed in another place, and striking statements have been made by some of our leading public men. The honourable Minister of Justice is reported at page 599 of the Commons Hansard as follows:

But neutrality is quite different. In the constitutional position of Canada to-day neutrality would mean that an enemy of our King could be a friend of Canada; that we could trade with him during a war in which the King might be engaged; that to nations with which the King might be at war we could send ordinary material, anything that a neutral nation could sell to countries actively engaged in war.

On the same subject of neutrality the honourable Secretary of State is reported at page 609 of the Commons Hansard as follows:

Just for the whimsical caprice of saying it, and for no good reason at all, we are saying to Great Britain, "It does not matter what happens; it does not matter in what war you may be engaged; it does not matter if you are on the brink of defeat and destruction, we are not going to help you." I am too good a Britisher to hold with such language on the subject.

I have read these two extracts because so many persons speak lightly of our adopting an attitude of neutrality in the event of Great Britain being at war.

Perhaps I might sketch the actual procedure of a declaration of neutrality. Let us assume an outbreak of war between Great Britain and some other country. On the very same day our Government must make a decision. It cannot be left to Parliament, for Parliament may not be sitting. But suppose the Government decides that Canada shall be neutral until Parliament can be called together. It is not possible under international law for a country to delay its proclamation of neutrality. It must do something on the very day that war is declared.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Supposing nothing is done, what happens?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Then we must be ready to resist attack. I submit that if nothing is done on that day, our position is not known in international law. We are either in the war or out, and the determination of our position rests with the enemy. But assume that on the day war is declared we do issue a proclamation of neutrality. We must follow that up with regulations by Order in Council interpreting the form of our neutrality. Those regulations, of course, must be consistent with international law and inter-