

this ship in order to make room for the construction of the submarines?—A. That is correct.

Q. I would like to ask if those particular submarines have not gone and if it is not a completed transaction with regard to them?—A. On that particular ten it is.

Q. That is all I am asking about—please understand I do not want you to give any answer that would reveal to the public anything that may be going on in the yard now, so far as war measures are concerned?—A. That is the point; I do not want to be asked with regard to anything that is now going on.

Q. We all know, as a matter of fact, that ten submarines were assembled there, and have gone across the ocean, and that is a closed transaction?—A. Yes.

Q. I want to ask some questions about that. How long a time did it take to assemble those submarines?—A. Approximately six months from the time the building was started until they were gone.

Q. According to that, then, you do claim, I suppose, that you were delayed six months in the construction of this ice breaker by reason of the assembling or construction of these submarines?—A. We mutually agreed with the Dominion Government to postpone the construction of the ice breaker.

Q. I am not finding fault. I am only asking to ascertain the facts?—A. What I am getting at is: it was not a case of being forced; it was a case of compliance with the necessities.

Q. I do not know why it is that you seem to act as though I were trying to get you into a hole of some kind. Is it a fact that you were delayed six months in the construction of this ice breaker by reason of the erection or construction of the submarines? Now, is that a fact?—A. Speaking in common parlance, yes.

Q. That is all I want then. Now, to what extent did the price of materials, other than those provided for by the contracts, increase as a result of that six months' delay?—A. The materials were ordered, Mr. Carvell, during the second half of 1914, a very large quantity of them. When it came to the end of 1915 considerably more material had to be ordered to complete the ship for the Russians. The actual difference in the price between 1915, the first half—

Q. 1914 you mean?—A. No, 1915, the first half, and 1915 the second half: the question you ask—I do not know without going through practically all the invoices and comparing them with the market prices current at the time, and to do that is practically impossible inside of something like three weeks' work.

Q. I do not expect you to give it to the dollar. I thought you might have some general idea?—A. Any figures I could give offhand would not be worth the paper they are written on.

Q. According to this statement, your materials cost you \$677,000 in round numbers?—A. Yes.

Q. And your machinery was contracted for at \$338,000; and your steel was contracted for at \$80,000. These, added together, according to my figures would make \$418,000. Subtract \$418,000 from \$677,000, and you have \$159,000. The material in this ship outside of the steel and the machinery cost around \$159,000, or \$160,000. You had a large proportion of this material contracted for in the latter part of 1914?—A. Some, considerable.

Q. Considerable, you say. Now, I would like if you would give me some estimate—and I admit it would only be approximate—of the increased cost of that \$160,000 by reason of the six months delay?—A. I am afraid I could not, Mr. Carvell. So many materials go into the \$159,000 worth of ship's material that to give a figure without referring to your books and seeing what the prices and the market prices were, you might be anything up to 100 per cent out.

Q. If you cannot give it, I won't press it?—A. I cannot see the connection between the six months delay and the cost of these materials, because there is no connection. The Russians took the ship early in 1916.