

companies appear to value a man by the shortness of the time he takes to bring his vessel from port to port. This has a good deal to do with the losses that have occurred on approaching our shores and also in going up the St. Lawrence. But it seems to me we pay a very heavy price for the sake of saving an hour or two in speed. Having crossed the Atlantic some sixty or seventy times, I have a little of experience in the matter; and I know that at present, when the passages are made so pleasant and comfortable, there is not the same desire as formerly on the part of the passengers to reach shore speedily. With all the comforts on board, electric lights in the cabins, exquisite music, luxurious drawing-rooms and smoking-rooms, first-class table, and everything as comfortable as possible, the passengers, as a rule, enjoy their trip too well to be in any great hurry to finish it. Some years ago, when we used to have to smoke alongside the smokestack on the hurricane deck and when our cabins were right over the screw, the case was different, and people were anxious to get across as speedily as possible. But to-day you cannot get people to risk crossing on a twenty-two knot steamer and pay the extra price, when they can cross on an eighteen knot steamer for several pounds less. I would urge on the government, in its negotiations for a fast Atlantic service, to keep safety in view rather than speed. The greater the safety the lower will be the insurance. If you insist on a twenty-two knot service, it will be impossible to get freight, because the rates will have to be so high to meet the extra insurance and expense of running these fast steamers. I do not believe that the country would care to pay a million dollars per year subsidy for a fast Atlantic service such as is talked about. Many of those who advocate such a service would be the very last to commit the country to the expenditure of a million dollars a year for it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In what particular does the contract with the Allans of this year differ from that of the 15th of March, 1901?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is the same contract.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I do not find in it any reference whatever to the ventilation of the steamers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is not.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I wish to draw attention to this very important matter. If the whole \$150,000 a year were paid for that purpose alone, it would not be money thrown away by any means. We have had up to the last year or two our vessels carrying perishable articles to the old country in a very bad shape indeed. The loss has been millions annually on the various perishable products, especially apples. The hon. Min-

ister of Agriculture has told us at times that he does not find himself in a position to dictate to the vessel-owners or to go on board these vessels and see if the fans, which the government pay for, are being used. But when the government give a large subsidy it should put a condition in the contract that these vessels be ventilated. Some of them are ventilated at a trifling cost to the government or free of cost to the government; but we cannot tell if the ventilation is proper unless an officer of the government has the right to go on board and make the tests in order to see whether the fans are being used or not. That cannot be done now unless by the courtesy of the steamer-owners, but it could be easily provided that we should have the right to do it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is well worth considering, and I shall take a note of it.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock), as our silence might be interpreted as an assent to his observations, I wish to say that I do not agree with him. We are living in a very fast age. As Fanny Fern says, we are all somewhat of the squirrel order, on the rush from morning to night. It is not the custom of travellers to-day to take very kindly to a slow road, whether it be a steamboat line or any other mode of conveyance. The faster we go, the better we like it. It would not be worth while for the government to provide a subsidy for a fast steamship line if it could not do better than eighteen knots an hour. I do not think we should give a subsidy to a line that would make no greater speed. If we have a fast line at all, it ought to be equal to the very best, or we will not get the travelling public.

Mr. LOGAN. I can heartily endorse what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said. To subsidize a sixteen knot service would be simply throwing away the money of Canada. Let us either have a fast service or not subsidize a service at all. We have to compete with the New York route. In my opinion, we ought to secure a fast service across the Atlantic with the least possible delay. There seem to be many difficulties in the way of our doing so, and I do not know that the government is at all to blame; but if we are going to have a fast passenger service, let it be one of twenty-one or twenty-two knots an hour. We should endeavour to divert British travel into Canada through Canadian ports. At present if you will ask travelling Englishmen how they came to this country, nineteen out of twenty will tell you that they came via New York or Boston. But in coming by New York, travellers get a wrong impression of Canada. When a man has visited St. Peter's in Rome