

would be only 17 cents. How then can the Government justify charging 36 cents, with the result of turning our trade to New York, depriving our seaports of their legitimate business, imposing an unnecessary load of 15 cents per bushel upon the farmer of the Northwest, and depriving our trainmen of the wages they would earn in carrying this grain over a Canadian railway instead of paying those wages to the crews of American lake boats and American trains?

The Government should not be bound by custom nor by the wishes of other railways. It suits the C.P.R. and the Grand Trunk to have this traffic go by water from Fort William to their big elevators at Port McNicoll and Midland, where it is in a convenient position to be reshipped to New York, Boston and Portland over their own or affiliated lines.

The Government is not in the same position. Their duty is to favour the Western farmer and Canadian seaports, and the weapon in their hands, in this great railway and Government steamships, would enable them to do so, at a great saving of money to the people.

J. G. SCOTT

*Chairman,*

*Transportation Committee, Quebec Board of Trade.*

As far as the port of Quebec is concerned, our only hope of obtaining a share of the grain trade, is through the Transcontinental Railway, which shortens our distance between Quebec and Winnipeg by 214 miles.

It is idle for us to expect that any share of the grain coming by water from the Great Lakes will come to Quebec. Why should it pass Montreal, where ocean vessels can be had as cheaply and far more frequently than at Quebec?

The same thing applies to grain from the elevators at the Georgian Bay ports. The railways may be induced to quote the same rate of freight to Quebec as to Montreal, but their influence and their interest will always be against incurring the necessary expense of 170 miles of extra rail haul.

## WHEAT TRANSPORTATION

MEMO as to the probable approximate cost of carrying wheat from Winnipeg to Quebec over the Transcontinental Railway—1,350 miles.

Maximum grade 4-10 of 1 per cent or 21-1-8 feet per mile.

Train load, 50 cars of 1,200 bushels, or 60,000 bushels.

Government reports show that the cost of freight trains in the year 1905, when this policy was decided in Parliament, in the year 1913, preceding the war, and in the year 1918 when the war was over, and the cost of wages and fuel had so greatly increased, was as follows:—including share of all general expenses and other items of cost of operating:

Year	Cost per Train Mile	Load per Freight Train
1905 . . . . .	\$1 21	260 tons
1913 . . . . .	1 60	342 "
1918 . . . . .	2 49	457 "

So that in the 13 years between 1905 and 1918, the cost per train mile had increased 100 per cent, or about 8 per cent per annum, and the load carried per freight train had increased 75 per cent.