

Van Horne, Sir William

March 12, 1898

To D. Lamont.

Van Horne is wrong in claiming for the Can. Pacific that either the Nor. Pac. or Gt. Nor. ever consented to a differential in favor of C. P. from St. Paul to Puget Sound ports or from any territory on Alaskan or Asian business. Tell how CP was kept out of San Francisco by payment of $\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars on freight and \$7.50 (first class) and \$5 (2nd) passenger traffic. Yet miners going to Alaska ($\frac{3}{4}$ are Americans) have to pay duty on their supplies into Can Yukon country & must secure a Can. license to mine obtainable only at some Canadian port. Gt. Nor. is not cutting rates

only making them conform to Can. Pac.'s, as they were notified would happen. Van H's claim that his road operates under adverse conditions differs from his claims in his ads re "most thoroughly built, best equipped & most picturesque and attractive line across Continent." Knows Van H. "very well and I know he is very crafty." He is mistaken about Grand Trunk being at the bottom the whole business. Re Pettigrew's opposition and Weyerhaeuser's Mississippi Logging Co. and "your" timber lands on the Coast.

JJH Letter Book, 10/11/95 - 3/13/99, p. 281