

Mr. KIRK: Yes, I do.

Mr. FISHER: Was a check made to guarantee or to substantiate that this loss was effective? Did you have an opportunity to look at the books of the Canada steamship lines?

Mr. KIRK: No, I do not think we did. But we did make a simple check, and we were satisfied that it was not overstated.

Mr. FISHER: Have you followed the effect of this subsidy on Canada steamship lines in the years since?

Mr. KIRK: No.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Have you been asked to by the steamship lines?

Mr. KIRK: Not recently.

Mr. FISHER: The introduction of the bridge subsidy must have given you extra administration costs. Have you any idea of them? Thinking in terms of this legislation, it will undoubtedly cost you money in the way of administration?

Mr. KIRK: The bridge subsidy has not cost the government any money in administration.

Mr. FISHER: What will the result be so far as the board is concerned in connection with this proposed subsidy?

Mr. KIRK: I cannot say at the moment. I do not know what the procedure will have to be. It may be that we will have to augment our staff, but I am not sure.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Do you think that the bridge subsidy will result in a percentage of reduction in that method? From what I have read there is a combined method, and these two methods are not analogous.

Mr. KIRK: No. I think the bridge subsidy basis was a compromise. The western provinces are divided more or less into two camps. Manitoba, western Ontario west of Port Arthur, and part of Saskatchewan would obtain the greater benefit if the bridge subsidy was placed on a factor of weight alone; it may be per one hundred pounds; and if you divide \$7 million into the anticipated traffic, you can say that every ton going across the bridge will get so much reduction. But the more eastern of the western provinces would probably get a greater benefit than the western ones.

Alberta, western Saskatchewan, and British Columbia would get a greater benefit by taking a percentage of revenue, because the rate is greater and the distance is greater.

It was rather difficult to reconcile those two views. So we split the baby in the middle, like King Solomon did, but it has added to our work. It is quite a difficult thing to compute it, but it has been worked out.

Mr. FISHER: The western provinces or their representatives have been before the board a number of times in recent years. Have they ever brought out any suggestion in connection with the bridge subsidy that you know of?

Mr. KIRK: I think there were some representations made but I cannot recall them. Perhaps they were made by the British Columbia tree fruits. I think the contention there was on a different basis entirely, not as to the method we were using, but that there should be a sort of bridge subsidy in a reverse way.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): Does this apply both ways?

Mr. KIRK: The bridge itself is both east to west and vice versa. They want another bridge in the west.