

3-4 GEORGE V., A. 1913

A. There is no inspection so far as I know. There is an inspection of evaporators but no inspection of fruit.

Q. Don't you think it necessary?

A. I think there should be an inspection of evaporated apples.

Q. What is the effect of an excessive quantity of moisture on evaporated apples?

A. They mould.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. A law went into force last year which provides that there shall not be more than twenty-seven per cent of moisture in evaporated apples.

A. In Canada?

Q. Yes, in Canada.

A. I did not know that.

HON. MR. BURRELL: The exact proportion of moisture in evaporated apples would be for the officers of the Inland Revenue Department to determine; it would be difficult for our inspectors to determine that.

MR. THORNTON: You have a fixed standard?

HON. MR. BURRELL: Yes, but the Inland Revenue Department deals with that.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. The curing of evaporated apples is practically of more importance than the drying?

A. Yes.

Q. The great trouble is that often the apples are not properly cured or evaporated?

A. There is no doubt about that.

Q. Even supposing the apples are properly dried they will not keep well unless properly cured?

A. No, they are not as good.

By Mr. Armstrong (Lambton):

Q. Don't you find the express rates, east and west, prohibitive?

A. The express rates are killing the peach, plum and the tender fruit business; they are getting the whole thing. The express charge from Forest to Sarnia, 22 miles, is 30 cents a hundred, while the same railroad company, over the same rails will haul fruit from Forest to Boston for one-half of that amount.

Q. What about the rates from Sarnia to Winnipeg?

A. In shipping fruit from Sarnia to Winnipeg the rate is \$2.90 per hundred-weight. From Forest to Winnipeg, twenty-three miles less haul, the rate is \$4.20.

Q. Owing to the fact that Sarnia is a port of call?

A. A competing point.

Q. Why is it that apples pay double the rate for live stock, two and one-half times that for lumber, three times that for grain, and four times that for poles?

A. I cannot see why there should be that difference.

Q. Is there anything about the shipment of apples that would cause more serious loss to the railway company than the carriage of other goods?

A. I cannot see that there is. I cannot understand the discrepancy.

MR. WEBSTER.—I spoke to one of the railway officials at one time in regard to the discrimination in the classification, and he simply said that the risk to the company in the case of perishable goods was so much greater. For instance, if an accident happened to a car of coal, the coal would still be there, but if a car of apples were smashed everyone knows what the result would be.

MR. JOHNSON.—Yes, but live stock, for instance, is carried at a less rate with much greater risk.