

Q. The Government has subsidized a wrecking plant and company on the St. Lawrence; now, with that efficient method which they have for raising steamers to-day, should not that assist?—A. Absolutely, yes.

Q. As I understand it, there are no serious black marks against the St. Lawrence route for the last few years?—A. Actually you can go back nearly ten years.

Q. The old steamers that got on the rocks were all successfully floated and brought in to the harbour?—A. There was a complaint made years ago that we had no efficient appliances for handling a vessel when she went ashore. Now, the plant that was available was Davies' plant in Quebec. Davies' had a very good wrecking steamer called the "Lord Stanley", and she went down to any vessel that was in trouble, but it took a week to get the vessel down to the wrecked steamer from Quebec, say, to the Straits of Belle Isle, or the steamer that was ashore in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There were no wrecking appliances below Quebec. It was suggested that we should have one at Gaspé. There is another wrecking plant now at Sydney, that serves the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick coast. I always held in the early days that those salvage vessels should have been maintained entirely at the expense of the Government; that we should not be compelled to make a bargain with them for \$500 a day when they were working and \$250 a day when they were not working, and so on; it was a private interest.

By Hon. Mr. BENNETT: Where is the plant kept?—A. Two at Quebec, and one at Sydney.

Q. That is a subsidized company?—A. One is subsidized.

*By Hon. Mr. Tanner:*

Q. Have the shipping men or the Government presented this matter to Lloyds since the occasion you referred to?—A. No, I don't think it has been actively discussed since about ten years ago—I cannot give you off-hand just the year we were over, but there was a record at that time, when Mr. Stephens and Mr. Brodeur and I were in London and discussed the matter fully.

*By Hon. Mr. Willoughby:*

Q. Is the cargo rate the same as the rate on the hull?—A. No, the cargo rate is so many cents per \$100. The insurance on the steamer is valued at pounds sterling, that is the English boats. The theory is the same, that is, the rate per cent, but on the English vessels it is per cent on the 100 pounds, whereas in Canada the insurance is per cent on the \$100.

*By Hon. Mr. McColl:*

Q. How much will the extra insurance cost on a bushel of wheat, based on the annual premium and the average number of trips the vessels would make each season?—A. It is only a fraction.

Q. How much does it add to the cost of transportation per bushel of wheat?—A. It is only a fraction of a cent per bushel, if you take it down to a bushel, because it is \$100 worth. If you take grain at \$100, at a dollar a bushel, that would be in round numbers 100 bushels, and the extra rate on a bushel would be a very small fraction of a cent; I could not say what it would amount to without figuring it out.

Q. Then the extra insurance is not a difficulty in developing more business down the St. Lawrence?—A. Not to any extent. It is one of the difficulties, and the money has to be paid, but it is spread over such a large amount of cargo and a number of steamers that it does not, except in the individual cases I quote, of full cargo, affected much; but in the work of an extra boat, that is where it taxes us. The owner who will insure his vessel for a year outside of the St. Lawrence will not come through the