

that altogether about \$12,800 was expended. I see, however, that there is something left out. These figures are not complete, because the figures which were brought down to the 30th of April show that the expenditure was \$10,980, and that only \$4,000 out of the \$6,000 of the charter party was spent. It is, therefore, pretty plain that some of the items have been carried over, and I think rather considerable items, because after this return was brought down we know that \$2,000 of the charter party remained to be paid, and the expense had to be incurred of the trips made afterwards and of carrying that steamer back to Kingston to her owners, as the government was bound to convey her at the expense of the country, and by the time all these are added I know that I am under rather than over the mark in putting the expenditure at \$14,000. The return brought down showed that she made 18 trips during the time she was placed on the route. Of these, three were made in the month of December—the 13th, 14th and 18th of December, 1896, and seven in January—on the 2nd, 6th, 7th, 8th, 11th, 13th and 14th. From the 14th of January to the 17th of April, she lay inside the breakwater at Cape Tormentine and never made a trip, while the expense was going on during the whole of that period and the hands were kept on. These trips which she made in the first of the season and at the end of the season, were trips that could have been made by an ordinary schooner. It was before the ice formed in the fall, and after it had disappeared in the spring. The service which she performed was absolutely no service at all. I asked for the number of passengers she had carried, and the answer I got, in this return, was rather an amusing one: it was, "number of passengers at \$2 each would amount to \$86." The department very kindly assumed, I suppose, that the members of this House would not be able to tell how much 43 passengers at \$2 each would amount to, so they make up the calculation, but they take very good care not to say that those passengers paid for their passage. The return does not say so; it does not say that any amount was received, and I doubt if anything was received.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Then the rate would not be \$2.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—The return says "43 passengers at \$2 would amount

to \$86," but it does not say that \$86 was paid, and I am unable to see in the public accounts where a dollar was credited. I have looked carefully through the returns and I find that it does not say so there. It only says that 43 passengers at \$2 would amount to \$86. And then with regard to the inquiry made about freight, "have no details as to freight carried." The government, it would appear, were know-nothings on this subject; they did not know, and there was very good reason they did not know, because there was no freight carried. The return does not say so, but says they had no information.

Mails were carried by the "Petrel" on the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th of April, 1897.

Seven mails were carried by this steamer during the time it was employed and paid for by the government, and, as already remarked, that was after the navigation had opened and after the ice had almost, if not entirely, disappeared in the straits, when any boat at all could have made the crossing; even an ordinary sail boat, except on very windy days, could have made that crossing and carried the mails for which a very extravagant amount had been paid by the government of Canada.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Is that the return for which you are now asking?

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—No, this is the return which I moved for last year. I was only able to get a statement up to the 30th April. I want a full and clear statement of the freight, and I do not want to get an answer this time that the government do not know how much freight was carried. If there was no freight carried, we want to know it, and if there were any passengers, we do not want an ambiguous statement such as "forty-three passengers at two dollars would amount to eighty-six dollars," but we want to know whether they actually carried forty-three passengers or any passengers, and we also want to know the full expenditure in connection with this service. Now, this subject had been engaging the attention of the late government as well as the present administration. There was a strong pressure, as I have already intimated, for some years back in favour of giving this route a trial, and it was the intention of the late government to have done so. The "Stanley" is now about ten years on the