

personal opinion, arising out of the good work of this body. The suggestion has a direct bearing on the question of domestic jurisdiction and national sovereignty:—

“While I do not undertake” (he declared), “to speak officially upon this subject, I may take the liberty of stating as my personal point of view that we should do much to foster our friendly relations and to remove sources of misunderstanding and possible irritation, if we were to have a permanent body of our most distinguished citizens acting as a commission with equal representation of both the United States and Canada, to which automatically there would be referred, for examination and report, as to the facts, questions arising as to the bearing of action by either government upon the interests of the other, to the end that each reasonably protecting its own interests would be so advised that it would avoid action inflicting injury upon its neighbour.”

The Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mackenzie King, who was present at this meeting, at once expressed his concurrence in the suggestion. Is there not in this suggestion an intimation that the exercise of a right may be tempered by equity and conciliation?

This, then, is the spirit in which we face our international problems. This habit of having recourse to arbitration and to peaceful settlement has given us the feeling and assurance of complete security. On a frontier of more than three thousand miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we have not a single soldier, not a single cannon, and the three thousand men in our permanent force are certainly not a threat to the peace of the world. This, then, has been our position as regards arbitration, security and disarmament. What is the bearing of the Protocol on these three points? It is my firm conviction that Canada, faithful to her past, will be prepared to accept the compulsory arbitration, and the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court. Further, I believe she would be prepared to accept all the sanctions that might be imposed in case she refused to accept the decisions of the court of the arbitrators.

As to disarmament, we have already attained the ideal toward which you are striving. There remains the question of sanctions. Prepared to accept sanctions against herself, in what measure can Canada pledge herself to impose them upon others? We have already demonstrated that in times of serious crisis we have a full appreciation of our international responsibilities. Canada, in complete independence, entered the great war, out of sentiment, not out of interest or necessity, and to-day she is raising in taxes for the payment of interest on her war debt and war pensions a sum exceeding her whole annual revenues before the war. Nearly five hundred thousand men, out of a population of eight millions, crossed the Atlantic, and sixty thousand of them did not return. When the war was over, we signed the Covenant of the League of Nations. We will be loyal to that Covenant. We are not forgetful, however, of the conditions under which we signed it. Canada was then far from thinking that she would have the whole burden of representing North America when appeals would come to our continent for assistance in maintaining peace in Europe. The falling away of the United States has increased, in our eyes, the risks assumed, and the history of Europe in the past five years has not been such as to lessen that apprehension. The heavy sacrifices to which we agreed for the re-establishment of peace in Europe led us to reflect on what the future might hold in store. May I be permitted to add that in this Association of Mutual Insurance against fire, the risks assumed by the different States are not equal. We live in a fire-proof house, far from inflammable materials. A vast ocean separates us from Europe. Canada therefore believed it to be its duty to seek a precise interpretation of what