

The WITNESS: Well, sir, according to my instructions—and naturally I have to speak according to the information which has been placed in my hands—I can make a definite statement that there will be nothing else.

Mr. FERGUSON: I want to see what both companies are going to pay. There is \$60,000 and \$125,000. Assuming those debts, those are, I believe, paid before they actually assume control?

The WITNESS: Right, sir.

Mr. MURRAY: Might I ask if this is a plan which the two companies intend to expand? Are we setting a precedent here?

The WITNESS: I do not think so. I have not heard a suggestion that other terminals should be jointly operated. This is the only one that we are considering at the present time in Canada as a joint switching terminal and, as I say, this has been a joint switching terminal for forty-five years.

Mr. MURRAY: I might point out that at Vancouver the same situation exists—a great duplicating of effort along the water-front—and in the terminal there are the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific and now the Pacific Great Eastern is coming into the picture. Could that not be applied to Vancouver and save a great deal of overhead?

The WITNESS: As solicitor for the province of Quebec I must admit that I am not competent to answer your question, because I have been in Vancouver only three or four times.

Mr. MURRAY: I understood that you represented the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The WITNESS: Yes, in Quebec.

Mr. MURRAY: They are an important factor in British Columbia.

The WITNESS: I am sure of that.

Mr. HODGSON: Would you object to having the amount incorporated in the bill?

The WITNESS: My difficulty is that this bill in its present form has been approved by the officials of the Canadian National Railways, the Shawinigan Water and Power Company and the Canadian Pacific and the Terminal Company, and I could not take upon myself to consent to that. If it is the desire of the committee I am entirely in the hands of the committee, but I believe that no useful purpose would be served by doing so unless there is some special reason.

Mr. HODGSON: I am wondering if we are setting a precedent, and more than that I would like to see these amounts marked in the bill.

Mr. PINARD: In view of the fact the statement has been made that we are giving the assurance that there is an undertaking that the amount of the purchase is limited to that amount I would believe that it would not serve any practical purpose to include that in the bill. Of course, I am again in the hands of the committee. If the committee feels that the purchase price should be mentioned that is all right, but I do not think that in view of the assurance that has been given that the price is limited to the amount of \$125,000 to be divided equally between the two companies—I think that should be sufficient.

Mr. HODGSON: That is only a verbal arrangement. I do not see anything on paper to that effect.

Mr. PINARD: I think the agreement in writing will, of course, follow. When the bill is passed and we have the power to acquire the shares of course agreements will be signed accordingly. There are the resolutions of the boards of directors of both companies authorizing the purchase at that price. That is why I say that there is an undertaking that the amount is limited to the price already