



Ask him

I wrote that there was some chance of  
being a reduction in the rates for cargo  
& passengers. The great result of the sailing  
of the U.C. with the service, ~~the fact~~ ~~see~~  
does not seem to have been very happy  
so far as these rates are concerned

The loss in the expense of the freight,  
if correctly stated, is certainly enormous,  
but it must be remembered that the  
freight was the first steamer that sailed  
on the new service, and that it takes  
some time to start a new service going  
backwards from 1889. That every cabin  
of B & C class was full in the month  
which sailed in November. They cannot  
therefore be doing so badly in passenger trade

See now  $\frac{9}{2757}$   
HAB  
Feb 1

HAB 27/11  
at once  
to J.K.  
H

Mr. Read.

205

Please see memo. below

1946

M. E. C. O.

20 JAN 11

Union-Castle S.S. Co.

I saw the following Directors of the Union-Castle S.S. Co. on January 13th:-

Sir Fredk. Lirrielees,  
Mr. Molton, M.P.  
Capt. Wiseley.

The first point touched upon was the fact that the original passenger rates proposed by the Union-Castle S.S. Co. would necessitate officers - for reasons of economy - sending their families home by one of the other steamship lines. Sir Frederick assured me that this had had the attention of the Company, and that they had now conceded what had amounted to a reduction of 20 per cent, practically placing the line within 5 per cent of any of the others. I had no means of absolutely checking this statement.

With reference to children, exception is taken by the Treasurer to the fact that up to 12 years children were carried free on some lines which is not the case on the Union-Castle. Sir Frederick pointed out that ~~xxxx~~ their rates were very much more favourable to children, as up to the age of 15 half-rates were in vogue, which was not the case with other companies.

With regard to freights, I called attention to the very high rates upon maize and beans, and the fact that one result of the advent of the Union-Castle line was an increase of 25% on the rate for these products by the British India, and their adoption by the Union-Castle - thus bringing the whole of the steamship Companies on the same level in this regard. Sir Frederick could not hold out much hope of any improvements in the rates on these articles and said that so

2.

long as the Imperial Government could not see its way to granting some sort of subsidy or rebate in Canal dues, very little could be done.

I called his attention to the extraordinary rate imposed upon sisal hemp, amounting as it does to no less than 70/-s. per ton, whereas I was informed by hemp merchants that the rates from India did not exceed 15/-s. In reply I was informed that sisal hemp was certainly charged 70/- s. a ton weight, but that as that product ran 5 tons on measurement to one ton of weight, the rate was really equivalent to 14/-s. I had no means of checking this statement, but will do so in the Protectorate.

I was informed that the loss involved upon the voyage of the first steamer home, S.S. "Guelph" was £3,900, and that under such circumstances the Company would have to seriously consider in the early future its position.

LONDON.

18th January 1911.