

That is really a large item of expense in handling cattle. When you put a general cargo shipment aboard a boat it is there, and you do not have to bother about it until you get to its destination, but when you have cattle, they require constant attention all the way over; they have to be fed and watered, and, if sick, have to be cared for, and all that sort of thing.

By Sir Henry Drayton:

Q. What is the general cost of loading and unloading a general cargo as against a cattle cargo?—A. Well, it is somewhat more expensive, because a steer has his own means of propulsion.

Q. Is there any credit in that statement on that score?—A. We have made a credit of \$875.

By the Chairman:

Q. Why not carry the more remunerative cargo?—A. The answer is this; if you are in the transportation business you cannot refuse to handle certain classes of traffic. In other words, a transportation company, whether it be a steamship company or a railway company, cannot entirely pick and choose the most remunerative traffic. You perform a general transportation service, and while, within certain limitations, you may be able to pick and choose with respect to the remunerative qualities of the traffic, you have got to take more or less what comes.

Q. You have to give a service to everybody?—A. Yes. It is like a man running a department store. You go in there and expect to buy pins and are irritated and annoyed if you do not get pins. Maybe he does not make a penny on pins, but he has to carry pins in his stock for the benefit of his clientele, and what he loses on pins he makes up on silks and neckties and things of that sort, so you cannot entirely choose the most remunerative traffic and reject the other, particularly in our case in handling a traffic like cattle which is so important, not only to the western farmers, but also to the Dominion as a whole. We cannot refuse to handle that traffic in preference to some more remunerative traffic.

Q. You take all that is offered—A. Well, substantially so. Of course, on the other hand, you have to consider this. Our ships are not particularly well adapted for the handling of cattle; they were not built for that purpose. This is not in criticism of the ships, but when they were built the traffic was not anticipated. Probably, if we were going to build new ships which would be exclusively used for the handling of cattle, we could build a more profitable ship, a ship that would enable us to carry more cattle at less expense, and handle it better.

By Sir Henry Drayton:

Q. For example, the Atlantic Transport makes more money on their cattle than we do?—A. I suppose they do. A very outstanding example of special types of ships for special cargoes is in the carrying of coal on the Great Lakes. They are specially designed for the purpose, and nowhere in the world is such a large tonnage handled, loaded and discharged, at such low cost, than is coal on the Great Lakes. It is almost phenomenal what can be done.

By Mr. Harris:

Q. Is it not a fact that cattle can be loaded at Quebec easier than at Montreal?—A. There is practically no difference.

Q. Perhaps you can amplify that a little. As I understand it, cattle have to be loaded on to cars at Montreal and then reloaded again—a double handling; whereas, in Quebec we know the car is put right alongside of the loading dock?—A. That is a detail, and I would not care to take the responsibility for answering that. Perhaps Mr. Doherty can answer that better than I can.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]