

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: The honourable gentleman may speak for himself; he is a very high type of man, I know. But I am referring to the common run of ordinary people.

I realize, of course, that another fact in the situation is the common fund of knowledge and ideals shared by the peoples of our two countries. I do not question the right of people to make speeches implying that we are a superior people because our boundary line is undefended, but their position is fundamentally unsound. If Canada had a population of 130,000,000 there probably would have been forts along the international boundary long ago. The great strength of the United States, on the one hand, and the weakness of Canada on the other, insure a prolonged period of peace between the two countries, the United States having given up all designs upon us some forty years ago.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Does that not prove their good-neighbourliness?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Yes. I am not arguing against that at all. And I do not mind people making speeches about that kind of thing, because I know they get a good "kick" out of it.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: My honourable friend is going to spoil a lot of speeches.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: No. I would not go so far as that.

I found great difficulty in following the honourable gentleman from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris) on another point. He referred to railways which run from Canada into the United States and back. They are not in the same class at all as a specially constructed road extending from the United States through Canada into another part of the United States.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: What about the Canadian Pacific Railway line which runs from one part of Canada to northern Maine and back into Canada?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Yes, it runs out of Canada and into Maine.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: And back into Canada.

Hon. B. F. SMITH: We were not allowed to transport soldiers or war materials over that road during that period of the Great War when the United States was neutral.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: What about the New York Central line from Chicago to New York, running 230 miles through Canada, from Windsor to Niagara Falls?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Yes, that road runs between the two countries, but its operation would never involve the question of our neutrality with respect to a third country, as the proposed British Columbia-Alaska highway would.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent speech of the honourable gentleman from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris). It contained a great deal of information which, in my opinion, did not bear strictly upon the point I raised. I gave reasons in support of the views I hold, and I concluded by expressing the hope that no definite step towards construction of the proposed highway would be taken until Canada had an opportunity of knowing what it was all about and this Parliament had put itself on record in the matter.

I maintain that the points I have brought to the attention of this House are important in the national interest. The Government would be well advised to pay some heed to what I have said with respect to the dangers inherent in any arrangement whereby Canada would permit another country to construct a highway clean through our territory and give that country the right to use such highway for military purposes in time of war. As strongly as I possibly can, I warn the Government of the potential danger to our sovereignty and our neutrality in any such arrangement, and the serious consequences that might flow from it. I repeat that I have no objection to discussions on our friendly relations with the United States, or the certainty of where our sentiments would lie if that country became engaged in conflict with another foreign nation. But if we are to discuss the question of an alliance with the United States, let us do so on its merits. Let us not be led into an alliance or understanding of such magnitude under the delusion that we are dealing with nothing more than the construction of a highway.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Would my honourable friend permit me to ask him a question? If an American company sought a charter for the building of a railroad from the American border up to Alaska, would my honourable friend argue that such a railroad would be as potentially dangerous to us as he asserts the proposed highway to be?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: A charter like that could not possibly be got.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: If that were being considered and the American newspapers expressed the view that the railroad was to be used in time of war for transport