

Q. We want to give the evidence in as small compass as possible because if it assumes a too bulky form we will not read it ourselves and nobody else will read it. Now, please continue your statement. A. The average schedule of passenger train or express train service on the Canadian Pacific railway, with which I have made comparisons and which I think will apply to other first-class roads, is 215 per cent of the average freight train service, that is, on the present time cards. In the summer time I think that the discrepancy as between freight and express trains would be greater.

A reference has been made in the evidence given here to the unloading in transit, and apparently in connection with that there is a misapprehension in the minds of some gentlemen, which I would like to correct. I have here a supplement No. 7 to I.C.C. No. C. 1183, C.R.C. No. 1797, dealing with the question of unloading in transit. I have no objection to leaving this with the Committee, rather than read it all, but I would like to say that it permits the unloading in transit at two points, and not at three points, as has been stated.

Mr. FOUND: It is three points if you consider the final point also.

The WITNESS: It may be unloaded at two intermediate points. That is the way in which it was spoken of before the Committee. Now, this reads:—

“Carload shipments of fish from points in Idaho, Montana, Oregon or Washington to points in the States shown herein (except California) may be opened and partially unloaded at not more than two intermediate points through which the car must pass en route from initial point of shipment to final destination. An additional charge of \$5 must be made for each such partial unloading. If desired, fish unloaded at intermediate points, under this rule, will be delivered by the Express Company to one or more local addresses for an additional charge of 15 cents per 100 pounds on the net weight of the fish so delivered.

The above rule, insofar as it applies to carloads of fish, is issued in compliance with order of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 391 of date October 13th, 1914.

I think you will find this was done because of this circumstance: My understanding is, I cannot state it for a fact, that there was some one company in the days of competition when there were no National Commissions to regulate these matters, offered it as an inducement and having continued it for a considerable time were required to keep it up.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would your company consider doing that?—A. Yes, we will consider it, but we do not think it is quite fair to us, practically giving the shippers of less than carload lots the benefit of the carload lot rate.

Q. What objection would you have to that as long as you get your carload?—A. What is the objection then to having a less than carload lot rate if you are going to make a distributing car, and give the people the benefit of a carload lot rate?

Q. There is just this reason: Fish has to be handled rapidly and distributed economically, and it is only by doing these two things that we can succeed in developing this industry in a country such as Canada, whose long lines run east and west, and getting our sea coast fish into the interior markets. I do not want to make a speech at this juncture, but I must say that the transportation companies of this country have been generously bonused by the people of Canada, and none more so than the great Transcontinental railway with which your company is so closely identified. We think now that when we ask you to consider the interests not only of the producers of fish but of the consumers as well, and when we can show you, as we can by the evidence of men who have preceded you, that fish when carried by fast freight does not reach the consumer in prime condition, we do think we have an argument

MR. W. S. STOUT.