

freight rates and passenger line abandonment services, et cetera. I would like you to relate your question to the bill, if you can.

(Translation)

Mr. CARON: Mr. Chairman, I maintain that that is because they are thinking of taking out the train on the other side and sending it two miles away from Ottawa, and the people of Hull will have two or two and a half miles more to travel and, from what they say, all because of the cost of freight. This has something to do with transport and I maintain that if such is the case I have the right to discuss the matter. That is why I have been trying to-day to find out what connection there was. They say that transporting freight is too expensive and I have proved to them that it is not too expensive because it is less expensive than highway transport. So all that is connected with transport.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Caron, it was not the railway companies who decided to put the station there. It was the National Capital Commission who decided that.

Mr. CARON: Maybe the National Capital Commission did decide that but it was after consulting the railway companies, therefore the companies had as much to say in the matter as the National Capital Commission. It was necessary to convince them that they should accept.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you first address your questions to the witness so that he can answer you and so that we can decide where to locate the station.

(Text)

Mr. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, pursuant to what you have just said and in partial objection to the whole line of questioning we have heard from a number of the members of this committee, it appears to me that all this bill does is to set up an agreed method of carrying out decisions which have already been made in the past by bodies that have had the authority to make such a decision, and that this is merely setting up a method for carrying it out. I do not think that the objections here should deal with the location of the railway or with what lines are to be abandoned, but only with questions on whether this should be carried out by the setting up of a separate Ottawa terminal railway company. If we go beyond that, are we not actually out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is the entire point, Mr. Regan. I did say at the opening this morning that in order to pass such a bill we should know something about the reasons why the station will be located at a certain site which has been agreed upon by the railways and the National Capital Commission. It is true I was hoping that as soon as possible we could dispose of a bill which is rather simple and which deals only with the administration of a terminal wherever it is located. I really think that the point we are making, or that some of the members are making, as to the advantages or disadvantages of the location at the present time are points which should be made in the house when that bill comes for approval. At the present we are only dealing with a bill which relates to the administration of the terminal.

Mr. TARDIF: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Regan. Everything that we speak about which does not pertain to Bill No. S-33 is out of order. In no place in this bill do we deal with the location of the station, and in no place is the schedule of the trains or the cost of the freight dealt with here. This bill merely deals with a company for the administration of the station which is located in a spot which has already been agreed to by all the people who have the authority to do so. All the time which we waste on other things than that is purely a waste of time.