

that that 35 tons of mail matter is carried from Canada and about the same quantity from Great Britain to Canada—say 70 tons of mail altogether. The subsidy we pay would be equal to about \$2,150 a ton. The ordinary rate of freight from Great Britain to Canada per ton of 2,240 pounds is from \$3 to \$5, and from Canada to Great Britain it is a little more. I cannot think that the maritime province people are availing themselves of the facilities provided. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says it is not so much the Rimouski route that we care about as providing these facilities for the maritime province people. Let us see what this means. An ordinary freight car carries 40 tons. It must be plain, when our total mail matter one way amounts to only 35 tons, that the maritime province people are sending their mail by way of New York.

Mr. CLARKE. That 35 tons includes packages.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, this includes mail matter of all kinds. I think it is clearly demonstrated that the people in no part of the country are availing themselves of these facilities. I think the time has come when the government should look at this matter seriously and see where we are at. Are we to have a fast Atlantic line? Is it a thing we can afford? What is our policy to be? Certainly, we should not go on paying \$2,150 a ton for mail matter between Canada and Great Britain. The thing, to my mind, is unreasonable.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). What the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), says may be quite right. But he was for a number of years Minister of Public Works, and I think he had an excellent opportunity to improve the St. Lawrence river so that large boats could go up and down it without danger. Before the hon. gentleman became Minister of Public Works I went down the river twice and returned twice. It was safe enough for me; and I think if it is good enough for me, it is good enough for the hon. member for St. Mary's or any member of this government. We are all anxious to see the port of Montreal well equipped and made a free port if possible. But we want to see the people of Montreal take an interest in their own port. I had the pleasure of visiting Montreal a few weeks ago, and that was not my first visit. I lived there over forty-three years ago. And in my recent visit I found Montreal, with the exception of the harbour, very little improved so far as cleanliness is concerned. The farmers of Ontario will hesitate very much before they ship butter and cheese and other goods that will spoil through tainting by way of Montreal. If there were any members representing the city present I would try to lecture them on this point. There is plenty of water in the St. Lawrence river

to keep the city clean, and if the people there expect the farmers of Ontario to ship their produce that way, they must keep their city clean. I will not say what further I saw in Montreal. But the next time I go, if it is not in better shape than it was two weeks ago last Saturday, I will tell you about it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This discussion has brought out the fact that this subsidy of \$150,000 is not given for the purpose of carrying the mail. It is given as a subsidy to secure these vessels going and coming by way of Montreal and St. John. If we get a well-established and satisfactory service, the money is well spent. As I have suggested already, these vessels should all have thorough ventilation. The minister has said that in one or two cases it has been stipulated in the contract that this ventilation should be provided. I would like the minister to say what lines are subsidized by this \$150,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Allan Line only.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is it contracted with the Allan Line that the vessels should be thoroughly ventilated?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' have refrigerators. I have explained that this subsidy is not primarily granted for mail services; I have never contended, and I do not think any of my predecessors ever contended, that we were receiving good value in a mail point of view from this service. Practically speaking, we could get everything we wanted carried at very trifling cost during the summer season; but you cannot maintain a service from the Atlantic ports in winter unless you subsidize it. That is the exact position.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that we are paying the 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' subsidies for cold storage. These two ships are not getting a subsidy at the present time for cold storage.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Have the government not paid anything for cold storage or for cool storage service on either of these vessels?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not for cool storage, and I do not think for cold storage either.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth.) Do the government not pay anything for cool storage on either of these vessels?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not say positively about cool storage, though I do not think either of these vessels are amongst those for which we are paying for cool storage. As to the cold storage, I am not positive.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The point is this: We are paying \$150,000 subsidies to