

APPENDIX No. 5

The WITNESS: Voyage No. 9, the steamer *Leader*, sailing August 16th; destination Cardiff. It carried 229 head of cattle, with gross earnings of \$4,580. The total gross earnings from that round trip voyage amounted to \$38,213.29; expenses were \$33,814.90, or a profit of \$4,398.39. That ship made the round trip voyage in 41 days as compared with 55.

By Sir Henry Drayton:

Q. What figure do you take into account for this delay?—A. Roughly, about \$500, but that is pretty difficult to do, I should think.

By Mr. MacKinnon:

Q. What was the destination of that voyage?—A. Cardiff.

By Hon. Mr. Graham:

Q. I think it is very important that we ascertain every time from what port in Canada the voyage was made?—A. These voyages are all from Quebec. The other lot I gave you just ahead of this were from Montreal.

By Mr. MacKinnon:

Q. Why should not cattle be sent from Montreal instead of Quebec?—A. Well, generally speaking, I think the rail rate to Quebec is preferred by the cattle shippers.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. By the western shippers?—A. Yes. I understand they prefer sending the cattle to Quebec. It is a preferable arrangement. They come straight through on the Transcontinental, and in many ways we prefer it, because, as I explained yesterday, it is bringing increased traffic to that part of the railway which is sorely in need of traffic.

Mr. STEWART: The point I was trying to make with regard to the extra expense to the vessel was whether that was an offset to the additional revenue to the railway—

The WITNESS: There is not a great deal in that for the railroad.

By Mr. Milne:

Q. The shippers made a statement here last year that it meant a loss of 18 hours going to Quebec, rather than Montreal. One shipper reckoned he saved 20 per cent shrinkage by going to Quebec.—A. Shrinkage on the stock?

Q. Yes, that he would save 20 per cent by shipping from Quebec rather than Montreal.—A. 20 per cent would strike me as being pretty high—

Mr. HARRIS: 20 per cent of the shrinkage.

The WITNESS: Oh yes; that might be. I think that is probably true.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. In the extra 20 hours of rail haul they would shrink pretty heavily?—A. He would save shrinkage by taking the cattle on at Quebec. Is that it?

Q. Yes. That point was raised by Mr. Graham that the inspectors in Great Britain did not all agree on the definition of "stockers" or "fat cattle". Do you accept their recommendations?

Mr. DOHERTY: The declaration of the shippers on this side.

Mr. STEWART: In taking your figure, they have no guarantee that when the cattle arrive in great Britain they will accept your classification here.

Mr. DOHERTY: No, I cannot say that.

The WITNESS: Oh, I should think they would have to agree then.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]