

that wharf it becomes to a certain extent a monopoly to the company in possession. The minister saw that he should omit the word 'person,' because in that case a wharf could be leased to a person who would simply farm out the taxes on every person who used that wharf, but the same principle exists even if you put it the other way. The present position is very bad and it might be made a good deal better if the department would put its foot down and make it understood that it was not doing things by favour, but that those wharfs cost public money and are a public privilege which the public should pay its small share for the enjoyment of. If that rule were lived up to the people would get used to it and they would not be pulling the coat tails of the member to get the wharfage dues removed or lessened. The existing system has arisen from our bad methods of administration and I do not say it is any worse under the present minister than it was before. Of course we are in a more difficult position now because we have built a great many of these wharfs where they never should have been built and that has multiplied the expense. The minister has, no doubt, thought over the matter more than I have, but it seems to me it is pretty full of difficulties. Unless the minister is sure of his ground and has taken good advice, he might let the Bill stand over for consideration, although if the minister thinks otherwise I do not press that view. Has the minister thought whether or not it is possible to make the carrier pay these dues upon the goods that he sends out from the wharf or brings in to the wharf, so that the department will not be compelled to try and collect dues on 100 or 200 little parcels.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the second section of the Bill provides for commutation in that respect.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it provide that the payment of these dues shall be made by the shipping company, and not by the consignor or consignee?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems reasonable.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think the wharfage dues are always included in the transportation rate.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, at present the wharfinger has to collect these small fees on each parcel.

Mr. PARDEE. The member for North Toronto has pointed out that the original lessee of a wharf might obtain a monopoly if others entered into business after he obtained his lease and wanted accommodation at the wharf. I understand there is a provision in the Bill, or if not there ought to be, that every company should have the

right to use the wharf so that no monopoly may be created. Of course there might be one portion of the wharf more favourable than another for mooring, but every one should have the right to use it under regulations to be fixed by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the present system if I ship a consignment of plums, for example, from one of the harbours on the Georgian bay to Chicago, the shipper pays the wharfage dues, and if a merchant in Meaford receives a consignment of goods he pays the dues for the use of that wharf. It is the shipper who pays now whether he be a private individual or a company. The danger I see is that under the proposal of the minister he says to the lessee: 'Give me a certain sum as a commutation, and you can ship all the goods over that wharf that you like.' The shipper who enjoys that commutation is in competition with other shippers in the same business, and his lease puts him in the same position that the Standard Oil Company occupies in relation to other oil companies, because by having this commuted rate he may send out as large a quantity of goods as he likes over the wharf while every other shipper will have to pay the ordinary rate established by the government. I would suggest to the minister the desirability of providing that there shall be no discrimination in favour of one as against another, as is done in the case of the transportation of goods by railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Would not this be perfectly fair? As it is to-day, there is, we will say, a large shipper and a small shipper of apples and there is a stipulated wharf toll on every barrel.

Mr. BRODEUR. One cent per barrel.

Mr. FOSTER. The man who is shipping 1,000 barrels pays 1,000 cents, and the man who is shipping 10 barrels pays 10 cents to the wharfinger, and they are on a footing of equality. My proposition was that instead of the man who ships 1,000 barrels and the man who ships the 10 barrels paying the amount they at present pay, that very sum should be collected from the shipping company. Then there would be no discrimination, and the government would look to the company for the payment of the dues.

Mr. BRODEUR. The difficulty would be to keep track of the quantity shipped. The harbour masters are paid very trifling compensation and they could not be expected to be on the wharf all the time.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not each of these shippers make out a weigh bill for the freight in and out?

Mr. BRODEUR. We would require some one to supervise that. I thought the better way would be to ascertain the quantity of business done by the shipping com-