

trading on the Atlantic was limited to 3,000 or 4,000 tons of wheat cargo. To-day we have in the port of Montreal vessels of 10,000 tons. The U.S. has developed its business enormously, and we need every possible assistance and encouragement given to the ships trading in the St. Lawrence so that they can get a fair share of the freight. We are at a great disadvantage with the U.S. ports, being open a little over six months in the year, while they are open all the year round. In those months we have to work our utmost night and day to get along, and I feel that the charges made by customs officers is an injustice. With regard to the canal toll we have seen within the last few years a change in the transportation business because of that. Previously a good portion came through our canals, but within the last three or four years the Canada Atlantic Railway, the C.P.R. and the G.T.R. have developed their business from the west, especially from Depot Harbor and Midland, and a great deal of the grain business goes that way. No business man in Montreal or in any other part is going to do business for sentiment; he is going to do it where it is cheapest and best. If the canals have not been holding their proportion of the trade, it is because they are not the cheapest route, and if by the reduction, or the abolition of these tolls, an impetus will be given to the business by all means they should be abolished. The steamship men of Montreal are with you. They believe these tolls should be abolished and they have representatives here to-day confirming that resolution. There is another disadvantage in the business, viz, marine insurance. It is not necessary for me to say that the earnings of a vessel require to come up to the costs of running the vessel, and something more besides. A steamer going into the St. Lawrence has the disadvantage of the extra insurance imposed. A reduction had been made on the C.P.R. fleet, but when you have an insurance of £8 8s against vessels trading in the St. Lawrence as against 4½% on those trading to the Atlantic ports you will see what the disadvantage is. The question is a matter of 4% on the value of the vessels in the trade. Marine men are interested with us in saying that the port of Montreal should be relieved from this burden and be placed upon an improved status. It is only by an improvement of the St. Lawrence river and by a relief from these restrictions that we will be enabled to carry the grain and other produce from the west at a cheaper rate than that carried by our neighbors to the south. Instead of having 20,000,000 bush. of grain through the port of Montreal we ought to do 50,000,000 bush., and I am sure when we have terminal facilities in Montreal there is no reason why we should not do 100,000,000. We must carry the grain as cheap as it can be carried to New York and exported. I was very glad to hear Mr. Murphy speak for the Ottawa canal, because there the Ottawa people are especially interested in the lumber business. That business used to go by the Ottawa route. Mr. Murphy's business was built up by transportation between Ottawa and Montreal, and he tells us to-day that that business is now going to Boston by rail and carried cheaper than we can carry it to Montreal. I think, too, we should reduce our ocean rates to keep that business. Last year 30,000,000 ft. of lumber were shipped through Boston which should have gone through Canadian ports.

Hon. J. I. Tarte said trade flowed through the channels of least resistance. It was beyond doubt that Canada had the shortest route between the west and the east, and both the waterways and the railways should be developed as allies on Canadian lines. It was a surprise to him that the canals had kept their ground at all, they had not terminal facilities at either end. Port Colborne was being

equipped slowly, and it was largely the fault of the marine men, who had not educated the public as to what was required in the way of well equipped lake ports. A few years ago Montreal was in a lamentable condition as regards equipment, and was not properly equipped at present. It was within his personal knowledge that the railway companies would not bring freight to Montreal because there were not sufficient facilities to handle it. Quebec, St. John and Halifax were neither of them equipped as they should be. What was the use of spending millions of dollars upon railways in the west if that part of the Dominion becomes American for all commercial purposes? If the lines authorized to be built at the last session of the Manitoba Legislature were all constructed, it would mean that U.S. lines would divert the trade that should come through eastern Canada. They should develop a strong Canadian policy with regard to the railways and waterways, and see to it that they remained Canadian for commercial and political purposes. Having referred to the work of the Lake Carriers' Association of the U.S., Mr. Tarte said Canada must have more ships if she expected to secure increasing trade; the St. Lawrence river works, with which so much progress had been made during the last two years, would have to be completed, and the lighting of the channels finished. Within the last two years great improvements had been made in this respect, and as a result the C.P.R. had been able to obtain a reduction in the rate for insuring its steamers. As a member of parliament his voice and work would be at the disposal of the Association.

Senator Bernier, as a western representative, said if proper outlets, both rail and water, were provided, the western trade would come east through Canadian channels, but at present they had to take the cheapest route, and also the one by which there was an outlet.

CHARGES AT GOVERNMENT DOCKS.

Jas. Carruthers, Montreal, in moving that the landing charges levied against steamers calling at government docks be abolished, because it is burdensome, and owners of such steamers in some instances are compelled to pay more in these charges than their revenue from freight at that point would amount to, said the Montreal Board of Trade and Corn Exchange, of which he was a representative, was heartily in sympathy with all the resolutions brought before the meeting. There were two points which should be emphatically brought forward. As a grain shipper he felt sure that the canal tolls of from ¼ to ¾ of a cent a bush. mean that if they were abolished millions of bushels would come by Canadian routes instead of the U.S. In fact, 1-16 of a cent would at times change shipments of grain from one channel to another. Canadian sentiment was good, but it disappeared when it becomes a question of an ⅛ of a cent a bushel. The Canadian marine should have a little protection, it should be built up and encouraged. They were not asking for very much; but the petty charges and exactions should be abolished.

The Chairman said he knew something of the hardships occasioned to steamship owners through the present system of charging at government docks. The Government had on Georgian bay several small docks, and steamers are charged \$1.50 each time they call at the dock. No private dock makes any charge for steamers calling, as the proprietors are glad to have them call on account of the business brought, upon which wharfage could be collected. Shipowners considered that charging the steamers for calling at these Government docks was equal to a fine, for if the steamers did not call there would be no use for the dock. If it were necessary to make a charge for the steamer calling at the wharf,

it should not be charged to the steamer direct, but should be added to the wharfage charged on the business handled. The steamer had no way of recouping itself for such a charge, not being able to place it as a back charge against any freight landed, and not being able to impose it on any business received from the dock. The charge, therefore, was a direct loss to the owners of the steamer. In many cases the charges to the steamer for going to the dock amounted to more than the total revenue accruing from the business done at the dock on that particular trip. For these reasons the steamship owners considered that such charges should be abolished.

H. W. Richardson, Kingston, said unless Canadian tonnage was enabled to go through the Welland canal free, it would all be tied up. If we want to handle our own grain we must take all restrictions off the trade as far as possible and deal with the Welland canal until it can compete with other ports. This must be done to hold the trade. We must not let the U.S. take this trade from us. We must make our canals free, and if this is done the grain will come by the St. Lawrence route. There will be under proper treatment, at least, 2½c. a bushel in favor of Canadian routes, and the increase of trade will much more than pay for the cost of development.

RULES OF THE ROAD.

A. A. Wright, Toronto, said there was a very important matter he wished to bring before the meeting, viz., the Canadian pilot rules, commonly known as rules of the road. In 1895 the U.S. Government amended their rules to suit conditions existing on the lakes, with a view to lessening the numerous accidents in the crowded waterways. At present the Canadian rules come in conflict in fog signals, the giving of vessel descending stream the right of way, and making no provision for lights on tugs and rafts, nor for distinct fog signals for a tug when in tow of a raft or booms. The Canadian fog signal for a steamer running light is one blast of the whistle, which is often confused with a port whistle, as the U.S. signal is three short blasts. Again, in rivers and narrow waters the Canadian rule says that where safe and practicable each vessel shall pass to the right hand or starboard side of mid-channel, which has really meant in the past that the most determined captain with the strongest vessel enforces his claim to the right of way. The Canadian rules do not forbid cross signals, and this should be done to prevent captains answering one whistle with two until the vessels come so close that collision is almost inevitable. Again, the U.S. rules specify cross lights on a tug towing a raft, instead of vertical lights, thus warning approaching vessels of the presence of a raft. The Canadian rules make no provision for this, nor do the Canadian rules make any provision for lights on a raft further than the old rule in force on timber rafts, which calls for a bright fire to be kept burning from sunset to sunrise, which is physically impossible on the lake. The condition of the rules puts vessel owners in Canada in a very dangerous position in case of accident, as owing to the limited number of Canadian vessels on the lakes, captains are compelled, for the safety of their vessels, to adopt U.S. rules even when in Canadian waters. For doing this they are subject to a fine of not less than \$20 or more than \$200 for each offence. He moved that the meeting request the Department of Marine and Fisheries to bring the Canadian rules in harmony with those of the U.S. This was carried.

EXAMINATIONS FOR MARINE ENGINEERS.

A. P. Cockburn invited attention to the injustice practised upon engineers engaged on vessels navigating the minor inland waters, who were barred from examination for the position of engineers on the ground that they