

Mr. HENDERSON.—I am convinced it would be a bad thing for the public as well as the steamboat owners. I do not want to be put under any restrictions; and there is a certain spice in losing money one day and making it the next. That is the way we are doing. The steamboat business to-day is more or less of a gamble, no doubt of that. I have seen years that we have earned 4%, and others that we have earned 20%, and others when we have lost money; but on the average we make fair average earnings, and we are open anytime to make a deal. I don't want to get down to be a freight solicitor—have my rate the same as the other fellows' rate, and then sit down and wait for business to be carted to my freight shed, and have a few solicitors out to get customers for it. I want to be able to trade as I have traded, and I think it is for the benefit of the public generally to do that. I am not a free trader, though; I am on the other side.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Chairman).—Would you furnish the Committee with a list of the Canadian vessel owners and the number of companies.

Mr. HENDERSON.—We would be delighted.

Mr. NESBITT, M.P.—What company do you represent?

Mr. HENDERSON.—The Montreal Transport Co.

Mr. MACLEAN, M.P.—Do you admit that you are a common carrier?

Mr. HENDERSON.—No, sir, we do not.

Mr. MACLEAN, M.P.—That is the real issue. Why are you not a common carrier; why do you say you are not a common carrier?

Mr. HENDERSON.—That is a legal point, and I am going to ask my legal adviser to answer it. I think you, as a legal man, ought to know why I am not a common carrier; I am only a layman.

Mr. MACLEAN, M.P.—I am not a legal man.

Senator POWER.—I should like to ask Mr. Henderson what, in his opinion, would be the effect of adopting this fixed tariff on the relative proportions of the business transacted—what the effect would be on the business going to the United States or to Montreal? I mean, will the adoption of this fixed tariff have the effect of diverting some of our traffic to the United States ports, or would it bring more to Montreal?

Mr. HENDERSON.—Answering the last question, I believe it would have the effect of diverting more business to United States courts. I believe it would have the effect of diverting business from the smaller companies to the larger companies. I think it would have the effect, ultimately, of eliminating the smaller companies. I think they would be simply run to the ground, and I think it would have the ultimate effect of higher freight rates.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Chairman).—I have been asked to see if Mr. Henderson would answer that question of Mr. Maclean's as to whether he is a common carrier, or what kind of a carrier he is. I might say that some have referred to some of those who have been operating on the lakes as 'pirates.' He would not like to be called a 'pirate.'

Mr. HENDERSON.—May I be permitted to answer that through my counsel?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Chairman).—Yes.

Mr. KING.—I venture an opinion off-hand now, but I understand the question has been up before the Inter-state Commerce Commission, and it has been held that a common carrier does not include the bulk freighter, so called, that is, the freighter that is carrying under a charter, as a member of the Committee here mentioned—the full definite capacity of his boat. It does not include the man who follows the tariff, who advertises a tariff, and who runs a definite traffic from a definite point to a definite point, so that all the world may know, and who takes everything that comes to his dock, and who is bound to take everything that comes to his dock. Now, Mr.