

I have yet to know that the Government of the day had anything to do with it at all. So far as I can learn the Canadian Northern and Royal George went to St. John instead of Halifax, because they found they could make more money by doing so. The hon. gentleman continues:

Well, what is the duty of the Government of this country with respect to the mails? It is to see that the mails from England and to, say, Montreal are transported in the shortest possible time consistent with safety. St. John is at least 250 miles further from Liverpool than Halifax is.

Hon. Mr. Daniel—How much nearer is it to Montreal than Halifax?

Hon. Mr. Casgrain—Two hundred miles.

The hon. gentleman is mistaken because it is a little more. I was not familiar with the exact distances, and I got the folder of the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway, and I found the difference between the distance from St. John to Montreal, and Halifax to Montreal, is considerably more than 200 miles. It is no less than 353 miles. The distance from Halifax to Montreal is 836·7; the distance from St. John to Montreal is 482·9. The distance in favour of St. John is 353·8. My hon. friend may say: 'But how about the distance from England to Montreal via Halifax and via St. John?' I will give him the information. He told me himself last night the distance from England to Halifax was 2,500 miles. Add to that the distance from Halifax to Montreal 836·7, and you have the distance from England to Montreal via Halifax, and it makes 3,336·7 miles. How is it by way of St. John? The log of the Royal George or the Royal Edward, I forget which it was, showed the number of miles to be 2,650, or only 150 miles more than the Halifax route. St. John to Montreal 482·9; England to Montreal via St. John, 3,132·9, or a distance in favour of St. John of 203·8 miles. But my hon. friend says that 150 miles is by sea, and a steamer cannot travel as fast as an express train. That is true, and I have taken the trouble to work that out. One hundred and fifty miles by sea at 18 knots an hour, would take eight hours and twenty minutes.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It is 250 miles.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—No. The log of the Royal George when it arrived at St. John showed it had travelled 2,650 miles and no more. The hon. gentleman himself told me the distance to Halifax was 2,500 miles, so that the difference is simply 150 miles and not 250. Of course, there is this about it,

the Royal ships go from Bristol and not from Liverpool, but I doubt that there is very much difference between the distance from these ports.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Yes, considerable.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—They have to go up the Bristol channel. Probably the distance from St. John to Bristol would be about the same as from St. John to Liverpool. There could not be much difference. But in addition to that the distance from London to Bristol would certainly be shorter than from London to Liverpool. And if the distance was taken, London to St. John, it would still favour St. John even more than the figures I have given. It would take twenty-four hours for the mail train to run from Halifax to Montreal, at a rate of 35 miles an hour, and a similar train from St. John to Montreal will take fourteen hours. In other words the time in favour of St. John is ten hours. Take ten hours gain by St. John on the shorter land route, and subtract the time lost or gained by Halifax by the longer St. John sea route, and you still have in coming from England, one hour and forty minutes in favour of St. John. The hon. gentleman was saying that there was a test made, and that the tests showed that the mails were delivered more quickly by the other way. I say after giving these figures—and they are absolutely accurate—that if there is any delay in the mails by which Halifax has an advantage over St. John in that respect, it must be due to the bad management of those who look after the mails.

There are several other matters to which I should like to refer, but I know there is a desire to adjourn, and I shall conclude by wishing, as the hon. leader of the Government did yesterday, and also as my hon. friend from Middlesex did, my hope that this will be a pleasant session as between all of us who are members here. There is no doubt that if we could all believe in the true independence of this body—an independence of both parties—we would not have much difficulty in criticising the Bills coming before us in such a way as would be an advantage to the legislation of this country.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I shall not trouble the House with a long speech.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—I rose to speak and I think it is usual that when a member speaks on the Government side, he is followed by one on the opposite side.