

6-7 GEORGE V, A. 1916

Q. Generally speaking, what would you say would best promote the object which we have in view of lessening the spread in the prices of fish between the point of production and the market, and also of getting fish on the table of the consumer in prime condition?—A. When it comes to the spread in price, here are figures (indicating statement) as to freight rates, Mulgrave to Montreal, on the less than carload lot rate, of 33 cents per 100 pounds, plus 10 per cent charged for icing. The freight charge on the actual net weight of fish transported (estimating the tare weight of package and ice in the package as equivalent to from 25 to 40 per cent of the gross weight) will run from approximately  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent to seven-tenths of a cent per pound of fish, the range in charge being accounted for largely by the varying quantity of ice that may be placed in the package with the fish.

On the carload rate, 28 cents per 100 pounds, and carload minimum of 24,000 pounds, plus the cost of 5 tons of ice, the freight charge on the net weight of the fish would run from 44/100 to 45/100 of a cent per pound of fish.

*By Mr. Sinclair:*

Q. I do not think anybody is complaining about the charge.—A. That is a very small margin.

Q. It is the facilities they are complaining about.—A. I believe, Mr. Sinclair, that the facilities by freight were fairly satisfactory until about the 1st of December.

Q. Well, they are not satisfactory for shipments between local points, and never have been, so far as I know.—Well, we would be very glad to have an opportunity of looking into that feature.

Q. I hope you will be able to do so. There is another question I would like to ask you.—A. What I have already said answers one phase of the Chairman's question. Now, as to the difference in the price of fish between the amount paid to the producer and that paid by the consumer. A very small percentage of that difference is taken up in freight charges you see. As to facilities, I believe the freight service, if there is a volume of business to justify the loading of full carloads of refrigerator car freight—the freight business is in the long run more satisfactory to the shipper and better than the express. The point is to maintain that fast freight service—that is my judgment—with sufficient quantity of fish back of it to give a reasonable load.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Have you any suggestions for improving the facilities for handling fish at different points?—A. Which, shipping points?

Q. At points of shipment and points where fish is set down.—A. At Mulgrave it is fairly satisfactory.

Mr. FOUND: In connection with that refrigerator express car service as I understand the Chairman, and as I understand the answer of the witness, there is a question whether the railroad would not object to hauling a 10,000-pound refrigerator express car?

WITNESS: If the express companies were agreeable there would be no objection from a revenue standpoint.

Mr. FOUND: I have in mind the extension of that service to Toronto and points west. The service was satisfactory as far as Montreal, but as I understand you the difficulty arose when it started to go beyond Montreal. You say it is not feasible to carry it beyond Montreal?

WITNESS: No.

Q. It was proposed some time ago that fish might be shipped from Mulgrave to Boston by way of Yarmouth and that a favourable rate would be made for express and freight shipments over that route so that the eastern fish dealers could reach the Boston market which, as you know, is one of the great fish markets. That would

MR. C. A. HAYES.