

Yukon country, but when that measure comes before the Senate I have no doubt that my hon. friend beside me and myself will be enabled to give a satisfactory account to this House of the course which the government has taken and of the reasons for adopting that course. Upon a question put upon the notice paper this House will not expect me to go into a discussion of the policy of the government with respect to that matter.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I am very glad to hear the announcement of the hon. minister that it is not the intention to send any minister to Washington. I think we have had plenty of that kind of thing in the past and that we have nothing to expect from Washington. If they want anything from us they can notify us. We want nothing from them and have nothing to give them. With regard to the speech of the hon. member of Shell River, it is very inconsistent. First of all he preached conciliation and good-will and seeing what could be done to bring about a better feeling between the two countries. That is all very well, and I think that part of his speech ought to have been made in the Senate of the United States. They are the first to be aggressive and to try to coerce Canada and take away some of the rights to which we are entitled and give us nothing in return. They tried by threatening to force from us concessions which they have no right to. There is no use making that speech here. The hon. gentleman after preaching conciliation brought in a bill of retaliation.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Or coercion.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—And so the hon. gentleman's line of argument is not consistent?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Oh, yes, it is.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Although I fully agree with him that if we do not get similar concessions from the United States to those which we give, we ought to meet them with blow for blow.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—There are now two bills. He wants to give them a double dose of their own medicine.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—We have nothing to expect from them at all.

The only thing they hold over our heads is the bonding privilege, and I think this country would get over that to-morrow if it was withdrawn. Commerce now coming to United States ports would come to our own ports. It might disarrange our railway system and traffic, but after a time we would get over it, and they would lose more than we would. I am not going to discuss the question of routes now. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intends the Minister of Customs to traverse those routes on his way to Washington. I hope not. When the Yukon bill comes before us we can go into routes and distances, but in addition to whatever routes we may have this side of the Rocky Mountains, we must have routes on the west. There is enormous traffic there, and whatever route you have here we must have our route, whether built by the government or by private enterprise.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I do not know whether this is the proper time to discuss this question. I wish to call attention to one or two remarks of the Minister of Justice. I understood him to say that the desire of the government was to construct a road which would not be subject to the interference of the United States, and that he was opposed to the building of a road through any portion of the country which might ultimately fall into the hands of the United States. If I understand the geography of that country at all, the port which the government propose to make the port of departure to the Yukon country is Fort Wrangel, which is in the United States. If the contention of the Canadians be correct, then Pyramid Harbour, Dyea and Skagway are within Canadian territory, so that if the proposition of the hon. gentleman from Shell River is carried out it is possible that these ports will be found to be exclusively within British territory while Fort Wrangel never will be. Even under the Washington treaty Fort Wrangel will always be subject to whatever regulations may be adopted by the United States custom authorities, and by such regulations they can virtually destroy British trade going into that section of the country. What I should like to know is how my hon. friend reconciles these facts with the other fact that Fort Wrangel is without dispute in United States territory, while the other ports, which are con-