

are several companies using the wharf, I will not advise that course in such cases.

Mr. LOGGIE. Is it intended that the carrier should add the wharfage toll to his freight charge? For instance, a carrier takes a barrel of flour from a city and carries it up the river, say, fifty miles. Will the waybill show 25 cents for freight, and one cent or two cents for wharfage, thus using the carrying company as a means of collecting the wharfage instead of leaving it to be collected by the wharfinger? I realize what the minister has said as to the difficulty of getting the wharfinger to attend all the time for the small commission he gets, and I sympathize with the minister in seeking to overcome that difficulty. But, inasmuch as these wharfs are built in the interest of the public at large, there does seem to be a feeling on the part of the public that the use of a wharf by an individual to receive a small parcel from a common carrier should not be the occasion for making a charge. It is well to bear in mind, also, that we have expended a very large amount on the canals of this country, and these canals are free for the public. It seems to me we go a little far in undertaking this means of collecting the wharfage. At any rate, if the common carrier will pay a side wharfage for laying his boat at that wharf, that would be a much more reasonable way to collect revenues from the wharf than if the farmer or small merchant in a country place has to pay a top wharfage for the delivery of a barrel of apples or a small box of hardware. If the minister will assure us that he will charge the transportation company a nominal but reasonable amount, based, I should say, on their turnover or earnings—say one or two per cent—I think that will be reasonable enough. But this should be taken out of the earnings of the carrier rather than out of the people to whom the freight is delivered. I would not like to have it said that we would not let a barrel of flour be delivered without paying tribute of a cent or two to the government. At the same time, I think it quite reasonable that the carrier pay for the privilege of laying his boat beside the wharf and delivering freight to the consignee. But I venture to suggest to the minister not to collect wharfage from the individual who receives freight, in the country districts at any rate. It is a different thing when you come to a city where millions of feet of lumber go over a wharf. It is a reasonable proposition to charge for it there.

But when you come to these outlying wharfs in small places, I think the better way would be to treat the matter as side wharfage. Then there is another reason. Suppose a regular carrier charges a small wharfage, how is the small wharfage to be charged on the man who receives his goods

by a special commercial schooner? Suppose a schooner lands at a wharf and puts out a box of hardware or a barrel of apples and goes away, who collects that wharfage? There is no contract made with the carrier in that case. Thus you are discriminating in favour of the man who places his goods on the wharf, not by a regular carrier, but by a special carrier, on a special occasion as it were. You see therefore that the carrier collects wharfage on his contract; you contract with him for the use of the wharf for \$25, and you allow him to collect fees from the receiver of the goods who deposits them there while the other man who gets his goods by schooner and has no lease from the government, gets his goods free—unless you make the corporation or carrier that has the lease, the wharfinger and give him the right to collect all wharfage. Unless you make him the wharfinger, you are discriminating in favour of those who receive goods per schooner. My idea would be to make the carrier pay the side wharfage and let the public at large receive the goods wharfage free especially in the country districts; it may be difficult in large cities. In Campbellton, for example, you have a wharf over which millions of feet of lumber pass, with a revenue of several thousand dollars a year. That is another case.

Mr. MARSHALL. Where goods are shipped by water does not the receiver settle for the freight before he receives his goods?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes, he does.

Mr. MARSHALL. The wharfage is included, so there would be no hardship.

Mr. LOGGIE. There would be a hardship in this way. If you add so much for wharfage, if the corporation or steamboat company, for example, says: We have no objection to give \$25 for the use of the wharf per year, we use the wharf, but we are not going to charge our customers who receive goods any more than if we did not pay the \$25.

Mr. MARSHALL. Why do we ship by water? Is it not because we get better rates?

Mr. LOGGIE. No, it is because we have no other means of communication. I have in mind districts where there is no rail communication, and more than that, where the trade is hardly sufficient to keep up a steamboat service, and in this way you are adding to the burdens on this wharf of those who receive the goods, or of the carrier, as the case may be; unless you make it a nominal figure. If you make a nominal charge for side wharfage, and do not go to the receiver for toll, that is another ques-