

to that Company? He said the contract with the Gulf Ports Steamship Company was made some time ago, and at a time when there were no steamers running between the Gulf Ports and Quebec. Since the line had been opened it had been a very successful line of steamers, and the Company had very good vessels, which carried great numbers of passengers and goods, and kept up intercourse with this part of the country and the Lower Provinces. But other lines of steamers have been established, and one or two more were about to be established, or were in contemplation; so that, at all events, there would be three next season. Now the service which the subsidized vessels render is simply that of carrying the mails, and when the subsidy was given to the Gulf Ports Company it was substantially to give encouragement to the line, but he thought the time had arrived when the subsidy might be reasonably dispensed with, and he thought it well to call the attention of the Government to the subject. There was also another matter in relation to two lines of steamers on Lake Superior and Lake Huron. A line had been established from Collingwood, and afterwards another from Sarnia. Both these companies were subsidized, and though it was somewhat illogical and unreasonable that it should be so, the late Government were obliged to yield when the second company put in a claim for a subsidy, though they had been building up the Company at Collingwood. However, in granting these subsidies, he endeavoured to make engagements with the companies that the subsidies would only be of a temporary character, in the hope of making the arrangement somewhat business-like, and he hoped the present Government would be able to make satisfactory arrangements, and that it would not be thought necessary to subsidize the two companies but select one or other, he did not care which, when the existing contract expires.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said as to the Gulf Ports Company, when the contract shall expire it was intended to renew it, but with far less subsidy than was originally granted, and as to the other two companies it was intended to ask for tenders from them, and if both were very low, and their services required, both would be retained.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER was of opinion that the services of both companies should be retained, as they were a great public convenience to the people in the West.

Hon. Mr. WARK knew what the effect of the subsidy to the Gulf Ports steamers

was. He knew that people who lived at the smaller ports suffered great inconvenience in consequence of the steamers calling only at the principal ports and neglecting the small ports. The trade used to be done by schooners, and they could be got at a moderate rate of freight for freights seldom went up to 50 cents, but so soon as the steamers were subsidized, they charged what they pleased, and their rate was 50 cents. The effect of the steamers being subsidized was to drive the schooners out of the trade, and as the steamers did not call at the smaller ports great inconvenience was felt. He thought that when steamers were subsidized there ought to be a tariff fixed. He had got freight down for 30 cents and 40 cents, but now the steamers were charging 50 cents. He thought that there should be some limit set to the charges, if a subsidy was to be granted to this company.

Hon. Mr. BENSON was acquainted with the trade of both lines, and he hoped every consideration would be given to both when the subject came before the Government.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER said that he was aware there were quite a number of holidays during the next ten days, and they were not likely to have any business of consequence before them for some time, so that it appeared to him that the public business would not suffer if they were to have an adjournment for two weeks; but as his motion was for an adjournment for eight days, he had to move "That when the House adjourns this day, Wednesday, it do stand adjourned to Thursday evening the 9th inst, at half past seven o'clock."

A lengthened discussion took place as to whether the adjournment should be for a fortnight or for a less period even than that proposed by the Hon. Mr. McMaster's motion; and in the end it was resolved that the House do adjourn until Wednesday evening the 8th instant, at 8 o'clock, it being intimated that it was the intention of the Commons to adjourn until Tuesday the 7th instant.

The House then adjourned.

OTTAWA, April 8, 1874.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 8 o'clock p.m., when petitions in favor of a Prohibitory Liquor Law were presented by the Honorable Messrs. Skead, Leonard, McDonald (Toronto), McClelan (Hopewell), and Alexander.

A message arrived from the Commons,