

fact that this large expenditure of American money will be worth while to the United States only if American troops and American munitions can be moved over this road from one part of the United States to another.

My honourable friend made a very excellent address, and discussed at considerable length a number of matters that are not quite germane to the question. I would draw his attention to this. As a student of international law—as a matter of fact, not many lawyers are students of international law—he should have noticed in this particular situation something which I do not think is to be found anywhere in history, namely, a road which starts in one country, proceeds through another country, and emerges in the territory of the original country. That is enough to give international law several jolts, because, except for the Polish Corridor between Germany proper and East Prussia, a case of rather evil repute, nothing of the kind exists in geography.

The question between the honourable gentleman and myself is, Who is going to build that road? Is British Columbia going to build it? Is Canada going to build it? I think the answer is, "No." United States press reports cause me to believe that the United States is being led by propaganda to take the view that that country should build the road; and what rather surprises me is that a great many Canadians are prepared to accept such a proposition as being wholly satisfactory and entirely without danger. I venture to say that if that road is built by the United States, either directly through its Government, or by the Department of the Interior through a private company, it is not going to be built for the mere purpose of connecting the mainland of the United States with Alaska. At the present moment there exists a free ocean, and everybody knows that the sea offers the easiest, simplest and cheapest method of communication; and, as I said the other day, until the United States is at war or in danger of war the road will be of no value at all to that country. The only reason why the United States would want this road is so as to have a land line between the state of Washington and Alaska. Persons going to Alaska will travel by sea, as they do now. Nobody will subject himself to the black flies, bull frogs and other pests which it is well known are in the country that the road would traverse, when he can make the trip comfortably on a steamer. I am not denying that some tourists who want to go shooting and fishing might use the highway. And does any honourable member imagine that merchants would ship goods by a lengthy road route when the

very much cheaper and more convenient ocean route is available? I cannot conceive that they would. So I concluded that the road would be of value to the United States only for military purposes. And in view of statements in the American press to that effect, I deemed it my duty to bring to the attention of all those by whom my remarks would be heard or read such information as I had on the subject. I ended my observations by expressing the hope that nothing might be done towards the actual construction of the highway until Parliament had looked into the matter.

The honourable gentleman from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris) touched upon a number of other things, such as our friendship with the United States and the certainty of our sympathy with that nation if it became involved in a war with Japan. I have no objection at all to those statements. The Americans are our very good friends, and we should much prefer to have them where they are than anybody else.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: There is no doubt about that. And I do not mind considering the question of an alliance with the United States, though I believe we could not do anything about that, because we are already in an alliance with other countries. We have obligations to allies within our own Commonwealth, and I suggest that if there is to be an alliance with the United States it ought to be made by the Commonwealth as a whole and not by Canada alone. I am bound to say that the concluding portion of my honourable friend's address was an argument for an American alliance rather than for a road. Well, I have no great objection to that. If we are desirous of discussing an alliance, let us do so; but we should be careful lest we find ourselves making an alliance for offensive and defensive purposes when we are intending only to discuss the building of a road. So long as the discussion is confined to the proposed highway and there is no possibility of other complications, all right. But I am fearful that if the road were built while our people are in their present temper we might make commitments that would endanger our neutrality.

After all is said and done, we have an obligation in international law to maintain our neutrality. My honourable friend from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris) seems to think lightly of that. I do not think lightly of it at all. I realize that if we fail to preserve our neutrality we shall have taken the first step towards losing our sovereignty. Therefore