

under the present contractors. I find fault with them for entering upon a huge undertaking of this kind without such information as would thoroughly justify them in adopting a particular route. But my hon. friend raised a point a few moments ago which I should like to discuss, and that is the reason of the government for refusing the offer of the Rothschilds.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—They made no offer.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Of course I accept the statement of my hon. friend, but I understand that there was an offer to build the road from the head of Lynn Canal for a subsidy of 5,000 acres per mile.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—The company which made the offer is the Rothschilds Exploration Company with headquarters at San Francisco.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—A United States institution.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—My hon. friend has suddenly taken a strange antipathy to United States institutions?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—No.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I understood the liberal party for many years had been denouncing the conservative party for their hostility to the United States and their refusal to enter into reciprocal relations of all kinds. I speak without very accurate information, but it seems to me that the routes from the head of Lynn Canal to open navigation would have been of very much greater service to the Dominion than a road from Stikine River to Teslin Lake.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—If that were Canadian territory from the head of Lynn Canal.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Let us deal with that phase of the question. In running through the Stikine River from Wrangel until you get into the Canadian territory you at once render yourself subject to all the obnoxious customs regulations and coasting laws that the United States have ever called into motion against Canadian navigation. We have never had, so far as my knowledge extends—I do not say it extends so far back as that of some honourable gentlemen before me, but I do not think my hon. friend can point to a single instance in Canada or the

United States in which we have had any serious trouble by reason of having one of our railway termini in the United States. The relations of Canada with the United States for half a century back has been disturbed almost continuously with friction respecting the navigation laws between Canada and the United States. Scarcely a year has passed but we have had trouble with the United States by reason of obnoxious customs regulations and coasting laws incident to navigating the various streams and bodies of water between the United States and Canada. No hon. gentleman knows that better than my hon. friend who leads this House, and he admits and admits quite freely that those same difficulties confront us in regard to the navigation of the Stikine River from Wrangel until we get into our territory, hence we are subject to all the trouble and difficulty which we have been combating in Canada for years past.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—We have treaty rights on the Stikine River

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—You have only rights to use that river for commercial purposes. One of the first purposes you will require to use that river for is the transport of troops.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—They can go in civilian clothes through United States territory.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—My hon. friend knows it would lead to serious international complications if we attempted to transport troops in that way through United States territory. The very point that has been agitating public opinion within the Dominion for the last few months arose through that criticised visit of the Minister of Interior to Washington when he conceded to the United States the right of sending a body of American officials, suspected to be troops, through Canadian territory to the Yukon, although they were going ostensibly as a relief organization or something of that kind. They were to go in civilian clothes. They were nothing more nor less than citizens of the great United States commonwealth, but we had the press from the Atlantic to the Pacific commenting against such a liberty being extended to them, yet my hon. friend says "send them in civilian dress."