

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Is there any danger in hauling them?—A. There is of course the hazard that comes with the attachment of an extra car to the train.

Q. Would it make any more difference than if it were an extra baggage car?—A. No, I don't know that it would.

Q. For every set of trucks you have on a train you have of course that much higher percentage of risk?—A. Yes.

Q. There would be no more risk in hauling an ordinary refrigerator car than in hauling any other car, would there?—A. No, I cannot see that there would be.

Q. They are strongly made?—A. They are strongly made.

Q. And are fairly good rolling stock?—A. Yes.

Q. Then the railway would not object to that car as a refrigerator car?—A. Not as a refrigerator, properly designed with proper trucks. We do object, though, to adding to the number of cars on through trains which are already heavy.

Q. If the express companies would agree to a minimum carload of 10,000 pounds for a refrigerator express car, would the railway undertake to haul the car on each occasion that that quantity would offer?—A. From Mulgrave we had that arrangement of a 10,000 pound minimum two years ago, did we not, Mr. Found?

Mr. FOUND: It was discontinued. A condition of the putting on of this freight service was the discontinuing of the other car; the railways did not want it.

The WITNESS: As I say, we prefer not to handle the additional car on the express train.

By the Chairman:

Q. If we could get the express companies to make an express car of a minimum of 10,000 pounds, would the railway haul it or would they object to haul it?—A. We would haul it.

Q. Even keeping in view the earnings?—A. Keeping in view the earnings. We made an arrangement with the express companies on the 10,000 pounds basis. It was in effect in 1913 and 1914. They gave us a minimum of \$90 per car, or practically 60 per cent of the earnings on the fish instead of 50, as on the ordinary traffic.

Q. There would be no opposition from the railway to that policy?—A. Not from a revenue standpoint.

Q. As a matter of fact you do not have trains so heavy that you cannot haul them; I mean express trains?—A. You take the ordinary equipment of the Ocean and the Maritime, there are eight cars in the ordinary train. You start with eight cars and you are likely to get extra cars either at the head end, as we call it, baggage or postal, or you are likely to get extra sleepers, and we do not care to haul over ten cars on any of these trains. We cannot very well make the time if we get above ten cars, and you are likely to get ten cars on your ordinary equipment.

Q. You cannot tell in advance, I suppose, what number of cars you will be required to haul?—A. No.

Q. The business originates as the train is going through?—A. Yes.

Q. Does the railway have to be consulted as to the rates charged by express companies?—A. No; the express companies make their own rates.

Q. Would it simplify the handling of fresh fish if express goods, mails and baggage could be forwarded by separate trains?—A. It would be a very nice thing if it could be done, if there was enough revenue to justify it.

Q. Then it is a question of the volume of business?—A. It is a question of the volume of business. In your question you spoke about express companies making their own rates. Now, the express companies are controlled by the Railway Commission.

Q. Has it ever been suggested that it might be wise for the Intercolonial Railway to do its own express business over its own lines?—A. I could not say that the suggestion has ever been made in any official manner. It may have been discussed casually.

Q. You have never given it any consideration?—A. No.

Q. It has not formed the subject of a report?—A. No.

Mr. C. A. HAYES.