

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Are your cars so built and equipped as to make it safe to put them on express trains?—A. I think they have been adjusted for that.

Q. I have been told that a special wheel is necessary to adapt them to that service?—A. A special truck.

Q. Can you tell us how many cars of that class you have?—A. I think there are somewhere between 20 and 25, according to my recollection.

Q. Are they new cars?—A. Comparatively new; I would not want to say what year they were obtained.

Q. Would you approve of changing the construction of these express cars so as to provide a cold chamber for perishable goods like fish?—A. I am not enough of a practical man along the line of car construction to say whether that is a practicable suggestion or not. I understand it has been referred to as a possibility, but I believe on that point, it would be better to have the advice of some practical car man.

Q. Would it not be a good thing to have a separate compartment for fish only, instead of having that class of goods mixed up with ladies' hats and other articles?—A. The traffic conditions vary so in the express business: one day you are running a car full to the roof with ordinary merchandise—I do not know about that; we would have to consider that proposition from two standpoints, one whether it was a practicable proposition, as far as car construction is concerned, and the other whether we could do that without being compelled to carry another car on the train.

Q. Did that proposition originate with this Committee or did you ever hear of it before?—A. I only heard of it within the last few days.

Q. That is the first you have ever heard of it?—A. Yes, the first I ever heard of it.

By Mr. Chisholm (Inverness):

Q. In extending these privileges to shippers over your line does it apply to shipments to the American markets? If there is a carload of fish sent to the American market over your line do you give that shipper the same facilities as if he were shipping to Montreal?—A. They have had some facilities.

Q. I think you said a few minutes ago that you never had any protests against increasing the minimum from 20,000 to 24,000 pounds?—A. No, I have not.

Q. We have shippers of salmon who keep their salmon in cold storage in order to get them to the Boston market for the 4th of July. There are several of those shippers in my constituency who gather the fish in order to take advantage of the minimum carload. Their great difficulty is to get just sufficient to take advantage of this car. I am surprised that there was no protest when the case was made more difficult to them by increasing their minimum quantity?—A. What was their minimum before? There may not have been any increase in their minimum.

Q. I understood you increased for all fresh fish?—A. No, that is in the Montreal tariff only, and to Ontario. I do not know whether there has been any increase or not on that traffic.

Q. They had great difficulty in getting a sufficient quantity of salmon to take advantage of the minimum car.—A. That is for Boston?

MR. CHISHOLM (Inverness): For the Boston market.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. I do not know that I understand this minimum scale, where the Government comes in and pays part of the freight. Will you make it a little plain to me; on what conditions does the Government or Fisheries Department come in and pay part of the freight?—A. In connection with the arrangement made for the freight service last spring, the railway obtains nothing from the Department for the cars that are run on Saturday. On the cars that we would undertake to run on each Monday and Thursday from Mulgrave and Halifax the Department agreed to guarantee us a minimum earning of \$35 for each car from Mulgrave to Montreal, and also agreed to reimburse us for the cost of the ice supplied.

MR. C. A. HAYES.