

running from Montreal and the rates were cut; but I understand some arrangement was made between these boats. I understand a new competing line is seeking a subsidy. I do not know whether the Government are considering the matter. As a matter of fact, I am told that it is cheaper for Halifax merchants to send their goods to New York and ship them by New York. Have the Government, considering they subsidize those boats so largely, any control over the rates charged by Pickford, Black & Co. on the goods they carry?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the Government has no control over the rates on any subsidized lines, and, so far as I know, it never has had. I do not see how it practically could have such control. I think that would have to be left to the competition in the trade, and to the general desire which I think all carriers would have to carry as much as they possibly could.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt the general law of competition regulates these matters if left to itself, but when the Government steps in and gives a subsidy of about \$15,000, the case is altered. If I am not misinformed, this same boat gets a subsidy of \$4,000 from Turk's Island.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe that is the case, and when the boat was making 30 or 40 or 50 per cent, Pickford & Black bought up the shares at par and are now practically the owners. They do not need to cut rates, they can run everybody off the track. The moment a Montreal boat comes into competition, Pickford & Black can put their rates down to a non-paying basis, because they have the Government subsidy. I am not going to discuss the subsidy now; it is of no practical use at this time, as the Government is bound for two years. So far as I am able to gather from those who are interested in the trade, they do not think they get any benefit from the subsidy. Three quarters of the fish shipped from Nova Scotia to Jamaica go by non-subsidized lines, and only one-quarter, or 25,000 quintals by the subsidized steamer. That being the case, I bring the subject before the attention of the hon. gentleman, because, before this subsidy expires, the House will have to consider whether the results justify a renewal of a contract involving an expenditure of \$103,000 per year. For my own part, I unhesitatingly say that the results do not justify the expenditure. The trade which was expected to grow up has not grown up, and, when the time comes to consider the renewal I think it would be well, in the public interest, to save that money altogether. I think the hon. Minister of Finance was to give me a general statement of the cargo the vessel carries to Jamaica. I do not want the details, but a general statement I think would be valuable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. FOSTER. I have a statement here for the year 1891-92, and for the year 1892-93 up to date. I find that the vessel carries fish of different kinds, potatoes and other vegetables, coal (a large quantity of this), oats, corn meal, etc., butter, cheese, nails, drugs and medicines, liquors, cordage, canned goods, animals, and various other assorted merchandise. The average for the year, value of export per trip, was \$25,143, besides 3,195 packages of various articles of which no value is given.

Mr. MULOCK. How many trips?

Mr. FOSTER. One per month.

Mr. MULOCK. And it costs \$103,000 to sell—

Mr. FOSTER. No, you must not come to that conclusion. It is bad enough the way my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island put it. The amount of subsidy paid per trip is \$15,000. The total value of export is \$301,712, besides these 3,195 packages, the value of which is not given. I have here the statistics of five trips for this year, and they average about \$23,000. The last vessel took 1,250 drums of fish, also other packages of fish, and much the same assortment of articles as I have read.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have made the point I wanted, which no doubt the hon. gentleman sees, that we send 100,000 quintals of fish to Jamaica, and the quantity is not increased since the subsidizing of this line; this vessel carries about 25,000 quintals, and that 75,000 quintals go by unsubsidized ships. So that practically we are paying this \$15,000 subsidy for carrying a very small proportion of the exports which go from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to Jamaica.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large assortment of other merchandise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But there is no substantial development of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; from the first it has developed, but the best development is on the Windward route.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was confining myself to Jamaica.

To meet cost of litigated matters  
(Justice) . . . . . \$20,000

Mr. CURRAN. This item is to provide for lawsuits that may turn up during the course of a year. It is the same amount as was voted last year. The expenses incurred last year were \$19,993.53, and it is estimated that we may require the same amount next year.

To pay salaries of Extra Clerks at  
head office, Ottawa; advertising,  
ing, copying, &c . . . . . \$6,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What position in the service does the late Minister of Interior's secretary hold, Mr. McGirr?