

61

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA,

COMMITTEE ROOM 301,

May 9, 1917.

The Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11 o'clock, the Chairman, Mr. Middlebro, presiding.

The Committee proceeded to the further consideration of certain payments made to the Canadian Vickers, Limited, for the construction of an ice breaking steamer (the "*J. D. Hazen*") for \$998,583.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. Miller wants to make some explanation in connection with the evidence he gave on Friday.

Mr. P. L. MILLER, recalled.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. When we adjourned on Friday last, I think I was asking you what contracts you had made at the time you made the contract for the ice breaker?—A. Before we go on to the real business, might I ask permission to correct certain portions of the transcript of my evidence, given on Friday. On page 50, I was reading a quotation and after the words "and form part of this contract" on line 21, it should read "That clause provides" instead of "That is the first clause which provides" and it should continue "that the contract is the same as our contract between the Canadian Government and ourselves modified only—" and you, Mr. Carvell, completed the sentence for me with the question "With these four additions," and I went on to read it right through "modified only to the extent required by the addition already agreed to and covered for in the price accepted by the Russian authorities, and any modification that may have been mutually agreed to between Canadian Vickers Limited and the Canadian Government up to the time of signing this contract. That is not the whole of the quotation; I went on "are to be included in and form part of this contract." Which should be added to the answer as it appears on the record.

Farther down on the same page the answer to the question "Had any modifications been agreed to up to that date between the Canadian Government and you?" Should be "I will not say they have been agreed to in correspondence, but there were some minor modifications in details which we would not be paid extra for as they did not amount to much." There were some questions about the London office at the time, but there was no reference to the London office in connection with that answer.

The next correction I would like to make, on the same page, and this is the worst part of the whole thing, is: My answer as it appears upon the record was:—

"The reason we took that position is that supposing work had been done under the instructions of the Canadian Government, the Russian inspectors of the work came along and said: 'We want that placed here, and not there.' We might make a change at the suggestion of the Canadian Inspector, and the Russian Inspector comes along with the plans of the ship and says: 'This should not be here, it is shown there on the plan.'"