

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. You say that a guest ordering fish and requiring a repeat order would get it without extra charge?—A. If he wanted more fish he would get it without any extra charge.

Q. Would it not be a good thing to have that fact stated on the bill of fare?—A. It might, but it might also lead to some other abuse.

Q. It might lead to a man taking a full meal of fish?—A. Yes. If we had nothing else to consider except making this order large and nice for everybody, it would be a different matter, but we are asked to exercise all possible economy consistent with efficiency. That has been drilled into us from the word "go," and there is no object in giving a man a larger order than you have reason to believe he is going to consume, because what he does not consume has to be thrown away and there is that much loss to us.

Q. Even assuming he wishes to have meat as well as fish?—A. If he gives a fish order and does not eat the whole of it that is the end of it: we cannot do any more with that fish which the guest has not used.

Q. With regard to dining cars on other railways, when an order is given for fish there is enough for two served. You know that, do you not?—A. Most of our orders are large enough for two. I have never had any complaints about the small orders of our fish.

Q. Patrons of the Intercolonial Railway have spoken to me time and again complaining that the amount of fish served to them upon order is getting smaller all the time?—A. I do not think that is correct.

Q. It might be worth while looking into?—A. Yes, it will be well to look into it.

Q. Are you in a position to speak as to the relative values of fish and meat from the standpoint of the quantity of nutriment they contain?—A. No, sir, I am not.

Q. From your own experience you know that a fish meal is not as substantial or satisfying as a meal of meat?—A. It is much more so to me.

Q. To you?—A. I am a crank on fish.

Q. Of course you do not perform any manual labour, that makes some difference?—A. I do not eat any meat. I prefer fish and have always made it a point to do anything I could to make the fish service a feature in our bills of fare and in our cooking.

Q. What does your meat cost you, for instance, your chops?—A. Our lamb costs us anywhere from 15 cents to 25 cents per pound, according to the season.

Q. And you serve two chops for 50 cents, the same price that you charge for serving a bit of fish?—A. Yes.

Q. And you get your fish for 4 cents a pound?—A. Yes.

Q. How many chops go to the pound?—A. That I cannot say.

Q. And you serve ham or bacon for 45 cents?—A. Yes.

Q. What does ham or bacon cost you?—A. It will cost from 22 to 27 cents, according to the market.

Q. Do you think it is reasonable, Mr. Archibald, to charge as much for serving fish that costs you 4 cents a pound, as for a service of chops or ham which costs you from 22 to 25 cents a pound? Does that seem reasonable?—A. Possibly not, but we—

Q. Mind you, I am not finding any fault with you, personally, it is the system we are after. I would be very sorry if you got any impression that you personally were held responsible for it?—A. I may say that of course we follow to some extent, the prices that the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern have on their bills of fare. And in any case, where our prices are different from the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Northern, take it from me, they are lower in every case.

Q. Where is the eastern terminus of the Canadian Northern, in Quebec?—A. Yes, I do not think they run any dining cars into Quebec.

Q. They are operated west of that city?—A. Yes.

Q. And they are many hundreds of miles from the source of supply?—A. They have other sources of supply yielding different fish.

Mr. L. B. ARCHIBALD.