

give the contract for the removal to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems unfair that the Canadian owner who loses his vessel in a position where she is an obstruction to navigation, should be compelled to pay for her removal, while a foreign owner under similar circumstances is not required to do so, the department bearing the cost of removal. If a foreigner comes into our waters and by some accident loses his vessel and it becomes an obstruction to navigation, the Department of Marine and Fisheries has to remove it and there is no way of making him pay a cent, whereas, if the vessel owner is living in Canada, the department may go to him and say: You must remove this vessel or we will remove it and charge you for it. I do not think that is a very good law, and I think that both should be put on the same footing. The man who owns a ship in Canada should not be compelled to pay for the removal of the obstruction when the foreigner cannot be compelled to assume that responsibility.

Mr. BRODEUR. The expense which is incurred for the removal of a vessel is taken from the wreck itself, if an obstruction to navigation is caused by the presence of the wrecked vessel, a claim is made upon the vessel itself so that in that case foreigners are on the same footing as Canadians are. If a foreigner should come into this country we might collect from him, but in most cases we succeeded in having wrecks removed by paying a very small sum provided the wreck becomes the property of the man who removes it. We had a law passed last year for the purpose of giving greater power than we had before and which will have the effect of saving the department a considerable expenditure that we formerly had to bear. Foreigners and Canadians are exactly on the same footing.

Mr. CROSBY. Of course, you do not interfere with a ship that is not an obstruction to navigation. There are not so very many men, foreigners or Canadians, who would leave a ship that is worth anything, if she is worth anything, they are going to sell her. It is only in cases where a ship becomes of no value whatever and is an obstruction to navigation that the department intervenes. My hon. friend knows very well that he cannot go to a United States ship owner and say: You left one of your vessels in Sydney harbour, or some other place. I want you to come back here and take her out, or I will take her out and make you pay for it. He would find it very hard to collect the money. On the other hand, if a ship is owned by a person in Canada, he may go to him and say: I want you to remove that wreck.

Mr. BRODEUR.

If the owner does not remove it, he removes it and charges the expense to the owner. Where any craft becomes an obstruction to navigation it is the duty of the Marine Department to remove it and get all they can out of it. I do not think it is fair that they should come back on the person who happens to be the registered owner. Somebody may have a mortgage or somebody may have collected the insurance while the registered owner would be the man that the Department of Marine and Fisheries would come on for the cost of removing the ship.

Winter mail service, \$7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for a boat service for carrying the mails between Prince Edward Island and the mainlands at times when the winter steamers are held up by ice and cannot make a crossing. Each boat has a coxswain and five men. There are also boat house keepers employed on both sides of the straits. The expenditure depends on the severity of the winter, and it is, therefore, necessary to provide for meeting the cost of the service. This sum has never yet been expended. I do not think that we spent over \$300 last year.

Mr. JAMESON. This has been a very severe winter, and I understand this service has been in operation. My hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Fraser), who is not present, would like to have something to say with respect to this item, and if the minister would reserve that right when his estimates are up for further consideration, I think he would appreciate it.

Mr. BRODEUR. He may bring up the question on any item.

Salaries and expenses of cattle inspection, \$5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you have this here? Does it not come under the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of looking after the inspection of cattle on ships. We have regulations providing the space which shall be given to cattle on board ship, and how they shall be fed and treated during the voyage. This service appertains to the Department of Marine and Fisheries rather than to the Department of Agriculture. This is not for the inspection of the cattle, properly speaking, but to see that there are cattle men on board, and that the regulations are carried out. We have cattle inspectors at Montreal and St. John.

Mr. SPROULE. Then this does not properly describe it because it is not to inspect cattle, but to inspect the equipment for carrying the cattle.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that would be more proper.