

May I say, I am not sure that my honourable friend is entirely correct in his interpretation of international law governing our obligations as a neutral. I agree there is considerable authority for his view, but I would point out that while Lord Birkenhead may be quoted in support, yet he admits that one hundred years ago the doctrine of neutrality in regard to allowing foreign troops to pass through neutral territory was entirely different, and that to-day it is at best a controversial question. International law is a somewhat nebulous thing to-day, and I submit that if Japan were at war with the United States, and we were not able to prevent the passage of United States troops over our highway from one portion of their territory to another, this would be a very slim ground for Japan declaring war against Canada. It might, after those two belligerents had arranged their differences, be a ground for action in the courts with respect to property damages flowing from such alleged breach of neutrality.

But my main purpose in discussing this military question is to deal with what my honourable friend sets forth as the very basis of his argument, the statement that in the event of the Japanese fleet defeating the United States fleet, Japan would be dominant in the northern sea and we should find it difficult to remain neutral. In the name of Heaven, who would want to remain neutral under those circumstances?

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Time and again public men in Canada and the United States call the attention of the world to the happy relations which have existed between these two countries for more than 130 years, and are proud to point to the unfortified boundary line running from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Do we appreciate what that means—that there is no other country in the world so fortunately situated as Canada and the United States? Australia has not the good neighbour that we have; neither has New Zealand, nor South Africa, nor Great Britain herself.

But I should like to call attention to the fact that we have an equally important boundary line in the north where Alaska stretches along the northern boundary of Canada for fully 2,000 miles. There are good reasons why we wish Alaska belonged to us;—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: —but, failing that, we are very thankful Alaska belongs to the United States.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: The Alaskan boundary comes down within gunshot distance of the city of Prince Rupert and of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, now part of the Canadian National Railway system. Under no circumstances would I utter an offensive word against the great nation of Japan. We respect that great country, but we have our own conception of the people whom we wish to settle in Canada, and we are determined to resist penetration by other races, just as Japan is. It is no reflection on either that the other nation has that viewpoint. We in British Columbia feel very strongly on this question. We know something about Japanese penetration. But this is no reflection on that great nation; rather, it is a recognition of their skill, their ability, and their untiring capacity for hard work. Though we in Canada have religious differences, we all go to the same Book for our religion; but the religion of Japan is fundamentally different from ours. We respect the Japanese, but we know that intermarriage, in the isolated cases in which it happens, is not to the credit of either race. These fundamental differences extend also to language and system of government. Yet if my honourable friend's suggestion should prevail, and we were to maintain our neutrality in case the American fleet lost control of the northern sea, there could be only one result, unless later the tide of battle changed: our neighbours in the north would be the Japanese.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: No. Before the honourable gentleman goes further, I might point out that in naval warfare it quite frequently happens that one of the belligerent fleets loses control for a while. On the other hand, it might not lose control at all, but existence of a submarine menace might deny that particular fleet the use of its mercantile marine.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Quite true. I understand what my honourable friend has said, but that does not affect my argument. If for the time being the Japanese fleet were dominant, its success might be the first step towards permanent control; though you may be so confident of ultimate victory by the United States as to say that the alternative need not be considered. However, I would ask my honourable friend to think of what would be the feelings and viewpoint of the people of Canada if the Japanese fleet had at least reached the first stage of control by their northern fleet. I say our main apprehension would be: "If this goes on, our neighbours in the north will no longer be people of the United States. Into this great wilderness of ours, where we have no highway