

ports. We are glad to go into Quebec, and have done so very often, and I think Mr. Power will agree that we have used Quebec very well, but it is certainly an extra expense. Supposing a ship is sailing between London and Montreal. Those are the terminal points. We discharge the crews there, bunker there, and can handle the ship much more economically at the terminal points, but I think Quebec has been used very well by the steamship people, and the freight rates have been equalized. I think Quebec has been favoured—

Mr. POWER: I don't know as you are doing us a favour. The facts are there, that it takes more to get the vessel to Montreal than to Quebec; you spend that much more. It is an extra day's run.

Mr. TEAKLE: Even our slow ships will do better than a day.

Mr. POWER: Well, say three-quarters of a day, or half a day. Why should the freight not be lower? There is the question of discrimination there.

Mr. TEAKLE: I don't agree with you. As a traffic man, I cannot agree with you in that, because there are the various things coming up which it would take quite a while to explain, but the general facts are these: as I said a moment ago, suppose you are operating a vessel between Montreal and London. She loads at London and discharges at Montreal. Every stop she makes in between is costing us money. There is the delay to the ship amounting to probably \$450 a day, port charges of possibly \$300 to \$500; somebody has to pay that. Distance does not figure to any great extent.

Mr. HEAPS: I wonder if Mr. Power wants the rate to Montreal increased?

Mr. POWER: I don't care. The point is this: that there is, say, on the export trade a discrimination of one half a cent in the rail rates between Montreal and Quebec—

The CHAIRMAN: You mean a difference, or a discrimination.

Mr. POWER: We call it a discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN: A difference—

Mr. POWER: In favour of Montreal.

SIR HENRY THORNTON: What do you mean? By land?

Mr. POWER: By land.

SIR HENRY THORNTON: We make the same rate from Montreal as from Quebec.

Mr. POWER: That will be by land?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: What do you say to that, Mr. Woods?

Mr. WOODS: We make the same rate all the way, Sir Henry (Thornton), ex lake grain, which is one half a cent a bushel higher than Montreal.

The CHAIRMAN: That is because it is farther?

Mr. WOODS: One hundred and seventy-two miles farther.

Mr. POWER: I am coming to the argument that for the 172 miles further, it should not count, because it is 172 miles further coming back the other way.

SIR HENRY DRAYTON: There is this about that: on the old rate they were all the same. You might as well say "Why is the rail rate to Halifax the same as to St. John, although it is 200 odd miles farther?"

Mr. POWER: So the distance does not count?

The CHAIRMAN: It shows you that distance does not enter into the question of rates.

Mr. POWER: That will come up in regard to the question of railway. Why should not Quebec be in the same zone as Montreal? However, that is not what I wanted to discuss now. What I want to discuss here is the fact that there is a difference of one-half cent. Why should we be obliged to pay that half cent? Why should the boats not stop in Quebec, and not take on that cargo?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: Because it costs that much more—considerably more—as Mr. Teakle has explained.

Mr. TEAKLE: May I interject there, Sir Henry (Thornton), that we are stopping in Quebec, and we put on as many ships as we can find freight for.