

to see any force in the argument that has been advanced over and over again that this is a purely Canadian route. If you want a purely Canadian route, there is the route by Edmonton which would open up a vast territory fit for settlement, it would prove of incalculable benefit to that vast western country, and would positively restrict the market to Canadian products. Let us for a moment see how the United States have practically possession of so large a portion of the trade in that Yukon country. Take into consideration their capital, take into consideration their commercial prestige, take into consideration the very large proportion of United States citizens in that country and it will readily be seen that the disproportion between the population of the Dominion of Canada and that of the United States, will manifest itself exactly in the volume of trade which will be carried on in that country. I do not think there can be a doubt of it. The United States transportation companies will profit as largely by the building of that road as the transportation companies of Canada. Those companies are numerous, energetic and enterprising, and we in Canada are building a road apparently for the purpose of working into the hands of the United States transportation companies and commercial men of that country without their contributing a dollar towards it.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I understood the hon. gentleman favoured the Lynn Canal route.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I say whatever route you open up there you open up for the benefit of the United States as well as of Canada, except you pass legislation which will discriminate in favour of Canadians against others. Any public work you carry out there will be more to the advantage of the people of the United States than to our own people.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Then the hon. gentleman is opposed altogether to a railway from the coast in?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—No. I say this, and say it with a feeling of certainty, that if this government will advertise for tenders for the building of a road with monopolistic privileges they will secure numerous offers from reliable companies who will build a road into that territory for the franchise alone without giving them an acre of pro-

perty; the very figures advanced by the contractors themselves, illustrate beyond all question or doubt that the franchise itself with the enormous profits incident thereto will be more than an inducement for the construction of that road.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There are a number of charters now in existence—two by the Lynn Canal and one from British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Let the government advertise that they are willing to accept tenders for the building of the road which will have a monopoly for five years of the trade of that country, and I venture to say they will receive several tenders from companies of strong financial backing for the building of the road. Mr. Mann stated the other day that his company would carry in from two hundred and fifty to three hundred thousand tons of freight this year over that route. The statements made by liberal members in the House of Commons on this same subject intimate from 50,000 to 100,000 people will go there this summer. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say 100,000 people will go by that route this coming year. The proceeds of the freight and passenger traffic from such a large number of persons would more than compensate the contractor for the building of the road—pay for it twice over.

Another most extraordinary provision has been introduced into this bill and one which is without parallel, is that it entirely excludes the application of the Railway Act. My hon. friend who is familiar with parliamentary procedure and parliamentary history cannot recall a precedent I venture to say in which a bill has been put through for the building of a railway in which the Railway Act has been wholly excluded in its application. I, however, have no intention of going into the various details of this bill, because I apprehend the opportunity will be given us at an early date to discuss it more fully. Suffice it to say that although much has been said against this bill, yet not too much has been said against it. It is establishing a precedent which is extremely dangerous, and above all that the liberal party should establish such a precedent of this character is beyond my comprehension. But they have been singularly unfortunate in their railway legislation since their accession to office. The action of