

question whether we should allow all our telegraph lines to pass into the hands of that company.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions..... \$33,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought we had dropped the item of \$21,000 for steam communication between Canada and Germany.

Mr. McLELAN. A company had an agreement for this service for three or five years, and was very unfortunate in losing a number of ships. It was supposed that the company had abandoned the route, but they have asked to be allowed to complete their contract. With respect to the \$7,500 for subsidy for steamers from a port in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to Great Britain or continental ports, I may say that this item was dropped from the ordinary Estimates. There was some objection raised on the part of New Brunswick that the grant merely aided the shipment of the lumber of a particular firm. Information was obtained from Prince Edward Island that a large number of farmers had been making preparations to export cattle, and it was decided to continue the grant so that they should not be disappointed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I can add a little to the information furnished. The hon. gentleman will perhaps tell us why the amount was dropped as regards the port of Miramichi. He can continue the service for the Bay of Fundy, all round the Halifax coast and in connection with Prince Edward Island; but I can inform him that taking away the subsidy for the Miramichi route is practically rendering useless the island subsidy, as a vessel cannot run on that route on one subsidy. The vessel was of great use to the Port of Miramichi, and although it filled up with deals, it carried fish, cattle or tanning extract of which a large quantity is manufactured. Why the subsidy is dropped, is because I am not a subservient follower of the Administration. I should like to know by what right the hon. Finance Minister struck out the subsidy.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it is right for the hon. gentleman to charge me with having struck it out. If he supposed that it was done at my dictation, he should have sent me some communication calling attention to it, but I have not heard from him on the question. I have heard from a great many people on the north shore that the only result of granting the subsidy was that a certain firm was able to ship deals at less cost than their neighbors. And for that reason it was dropped—knowing the differences of opinion among the various shippers and manufacturers of lumber along the coast, as well as the feelings of some of the parties in Prince Edward Island in respect to the class of boats used last year—a class that cost a very high insurance—it was dropped from the main Estimates. Representations were made from the island that it was desirable to have encouragement to some boat to call there. If the steamers that run to Miramichi are of the proper class, arrangements may be made with them as far as this \$1,500 will go, and we think it will be sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says that if I had desired this I should have communicated with him. Well, my experience in communicating with him has not been of a very satisfactory character. I have frequently addressed him with but little result; so much so that I have ceased to address him. But what I did do was to get several of the representatives, both of our Province and the island, who are interested in the matter, to speak to the hon. gentleman on the subject. I know that a representative was sent from the firm who owned these steamers to have an interview with the hon. gentleman on this subject, and he called on me to see what I would advise, and he asked me to go with him. I said there is no use; I will only do you harm with the Finance Minister, and I had better stay away. The

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

hon. gentleman speaks about the island being served, and about the island calling on him for a subsidy. Why, Sir, the ground on which the double subsidy was given last year was that it required both subsidies to get the firm to put on vessels that were suitable, and I think he has treated that section of the country very unfairly. The hon. gentleman knows very well that if I had thought that my requesting it would be of any service I would have written him a ream of paper on the subject, but I had written him so much and so little attention was paid to it that I thought it was of no use to communicate with him.

Mr. McLELAN. I have only known two instances in which the hon. gentleman has addressed me on public matters, on which his representations have not been met, and in those instances I did not think that it was in the public interest that his views should be met.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will refer to the records of his department.

Mr. McLELAN. One was on the question of an increase of salary to his brother, and the other was the superannuation of a lighthouse keeper and the appointment of an older man than the one he wished to have superannuated.

Mr. MITCHELL. Since the hon. gentleman has referred to it, I will state the kind of justice I have received from him. It is true that I did ask that my brother should be restored, as a number of other officers had been restored to the same positions, in point of salary, which they had occupied before the Mackenzie Government came in, that Government having reduced their salaries. I found that out of some twelve officers whose salaries had been reduced by Mr. Mackenzie, every one of them but my brother was restored to their old positions. I had correspondence with the hon. gentleman, and had frequent interviews with him, and he repeatedly admitted that it was a great hardship that he should be treated differently from the others. I pointed out numerous instances in his own Province and in mine, and I said that I did not care for the amount of money but that it was a slur on a good officer that he should not be restored to his old position, as the others had been. Those are the facts of the case, and the hon. gentleman knows them to be the facts of the case, and he knows it to be an act of injustice, and that he repeatedly promised to have the matter rectified and never kept his promise.

Mr. McLELAN. No, I never promised.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then he says that I wanted one man superannuated and another put in his place who was older than the man whom I wished superannuated. I say that is not true.

Mr. McLELAN. Then you put what is untrue on the records yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has the records there in the Department and I challenge him to bring them here. I will tell the House the facts. There are three lighthouses in the Bay of Miramichi, at the angles of a triangle so to speak—one of them being occupied by this Mr. Savoy. I wanted Mr. Savoy, who is 63 years of age, superannuated and another person, a younger man put in, and I wanted the others shifted so that the arrangement would be more convenient to the people there. I wanted old Mr. Savoy superannuated and his nephew, a young man, put in his place. The hon. gentleman does not remember the incidents as well as I do. But he would not do it, and a little feeling arose and the injustice which the hon. gentleman perpetrated in connection with my brother's case induced me to feel that it was not worth my while to send communications to him.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says that injustice was done him in the case of his brother, that I promised