

*By Mr. Michaud:*

Q. On page 3, Parker Fountain Pens Limited, the date sold is given as April 14, 1946. Is that a misprint?—A. I am afraid that is a misprint. There may be other misprints in these sheets because we started typing these at nine o'clock this morning.

*By Mr. Coté:*

Q. You mentioned, Mr. Berry, that the sale price does include the equipment in the buildings?—A. In quite a number of cases it includes the equipment as well as the building.

Q. Does the original cost cover only the cost of the building?—A. No, it covers the building and equipment.

*By Mr. Reid:*

Q. While I realize it may be largely a bookkeeping entry in the sale of property to the custodian there is an item there, Dominion Foundries and Steel Limited at Hamilton, custodian, where the original cost was \$141,000, and it sold for \$5,000 making a percentage of 3.55. That seems rather low. Just what is the story behind that?—A. I think I can explain that one in reasonable detail now. That one was a project that was started during wartime to put up additional facilities for the production of armour plate, and as soon as we had started it was found that armour plate was not required so at that point the contract was cancelled. This \$5,000 represents the recovery from Dominion Foundries in respect of what might be called the stubs and concrete foundations on the ground which otherwise if we had not sold it to Dominion Foundries we were obligated to remove and take out and restore the land to its original contours. Therefore, personally I would suggest that was a pretty good deal although it looks very strange on the record just put down coldly in this way.

*By Mr. McGregor:*

Q. The building was never erected?—A. The building was never completed.

Q. How big was the building?—A. It was a pretty big building. It was for the heat treatment of armour plate. The buildings were not completed. Part of it was run up to one storey with a concrete top on the thing but no sides. Parts of it consisted of just the foundation with stubs. Another part of it was a pit for the equipment that was to be installed, and so on.

*By Mr. Reid:*

Q. Why I raised the point was that as to these items here the custodian purchases at a far lower figure than other companies. The percentages are much lower, and the thought went through my mind—and I will be able to discuss the matter later on at the proper time—that departments of government in purchasing supplies are usually charged more than private individuals. If you go into these items here the custodian, while after all is a government body— —A. No, the custodian is a private company.

*By Mr. Coté:*

Q. Could you give us the story as to the lower rate of recovery here with Crane Limited, Montreal, where the original cost was \$53,000, and the sale price was \$5,000?—A. I will be glad to get that. I think likely the file is here.

Q. That is in Montreal and I am interested in that one.—A. I will have the file but it will take me some time to go into detail.

Q. It is just to explain the low rate of recovery, 9.35 per cent, just to give us an idea. I do not request any particular data but just a general statement.—A. If I remember rightly that building was constructed on private land.