

meadows, although often wet, having hard bottom almost invariably.

Under the heading of "Tourist Trade," the memorandum has this to say:

The Alaskan highway will be a great tourist attraction. Most of the traffic will undoubtedly be of American origin, motivated by a desire to see America's only continental possession. The 2,200 mile trip from Vancouver to Fairbanks will, however, be within the range of only the wealthier tourists. British Columbia will be in the fortunate position of being the chief gainer of all American and Alaskan publicity to see Alaska.

There will be another group of tourists drawn to northern British Columbia because of the unrivalled game and fishing resources of this area. The district north of the Grand Trunk is noted as being the best big game district on the continent. In the Cassiar district record trophies have been secured of moose, caribou, stone, fannin and Big Horn sheep, mountain goat, grizzly, silver tip and black bear. In addition, the smaller fur-bearing animals such as beaver, muskrat, fox, mink, marten, weasel and otter are plentiful.

An analysis of the estimated tourist traffic which would be attracted to this highway is given at page 37 of the American commission's report of 1933, to which I have already referred. It gives a conservative estimate of the number of cars likely to travel over the new highway the whole distance to Dawson or Fairbanks, the first year the highway is open, as 3,100; the second year, 3,300; the third year, 3,500; the fourth year, 3,750, and the fifth year, 3,950. Most estimates are three or four times as large as this, and only the imagination can picture the very much greater number of cars that would take the shorter intermediate trips, all of which would terminate in the province of British Columbia.

I have already quoted from the American commission's report to show the assistance that the road would give to aeroplane travel. From this and the other viewpoints that I have mentioned, indications are that industrial and financial benefits accruing from the road to British Columbia, and therefore to Canada, would be far greater than those to the territory of Alaska. It is true that one of our motives for constructing the road could not be the bringing of Canadian citizens in the far northern parts of British Columbia into contact with their southern fellow citizens, since none of our people are living in those northern areas. Nevertheless, I submit, we are interested for sentimental as well as financial reasons in seeing that this great area is opened and developed.

In these sketchy remarks I have attempted to show why my honourable friend from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach) has no logical justification for concluding that the main, if not almost the exclusive, purpose of

the proposed road would be a military one, and that the people of Canada would not be interested in it for any other purpose.

I want to say a little about the military aspects of the road. I hesitate to do so for fear that I may play into the hands, if I may so put it, of my honourable friend. I should be sorry to have anyone regard my discussion of the military aspects of the highway as evidence that British Columbia is advocating its construction because of those aspects. I have no hesitation in saying that any argument advanced from a military standpoint would not support my honourable friend's position, but would show an additional reason why the road would be beneficial to the province. My honourable friend has indicated that in this connection there are two distinct problems, and I should prefer to discuss the matter on the basis of those problems. First, he says, construction of the road might lead to the surrender of our sovereignty over the territory affected; and his second point was, in effect, that in certain circumstances it might prevent the possibility of our remaining neutral and thereby involve us in international complications.

As to his first point, I certainly do not know of any Canadian, and I think there is none, who for one minute would even dream of the idea that we should surrender any of our national territorial rights. Opposition to that must be accepted as common ground. My honourable friend seems to be worried over what might happen if the road were constructed with American money. There is nothing very startling, I suggest to honourable senators, in having works constructed in Canada with American money. A lot of capital has come over to this country from the United States, and we do not regret the fact. It has been of inestimable advantage in the development of our country. And in connection with this proposed highway no suggestion has ever been made that we should surrender any of our sovereign rights. If honourable senators will read the Order in Council which my honourable friend incorporated in his speech, they will see that the commission appointed by the Dominion Government is empowered only to investigate, to survey, to find out facts and report to the Government what the real situation is. One would not think the appointment of that commission a very perilous step to take. I am confident that if, as the result of inquiries about to be made, something is done towards the construction of this road, no matter what Government may be in power in this Dominion when the necessary treaty is being negotiated, it will contain in unequivocal terms ample safeguards to preserve our sovereign rights.