

You may talk about it as much as you like, but it cannot be done. I say it was a most absurd and ruinous policy to continue building ships after the war was over, and to run them at a loss, and then to say that we have to shape our tariff so as to get revenue for expenditure in these matters.

Are we going to continue every enterprise in Canada, no matter what it cost? Let us take the building of ships by the Canadian Vickers Company in Montreal. They built some ships for the Government, and they were built not at a contract price, but at cost plus. What do you think they charged for every man that \$10 a day was paid to? They charged the Dominion Government \$18.15, besides 10 per cent over the cost of the materials that went into the ships. I have seen it stated half-a-dozen times lately that the Canadian Vickers Company will have to shut down unless the Government comes to their rescue with more orders.

Hon. G. D. ROBERTSON: I must take exception to the statement of my honourable friend with regard to the nature of the contract with the Vickers Company. I happen to know that those ships were built on a contract price per ton basis, and that that price was lower than the price in some of the other shipyards. I know, too, that the workman did not receive a wage of anything like \$10 a day.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: I do not mean to say that the men received \$10 a day; but for every \$10 a day paid to the men the Vickers Company charged \$18.15. That is the sworn evidence of the Company, and my honourable friend, if he wishes, can look up the records of the House of Commons where he will find the sworn statement made by members of the Vickers Company that on every \$10 paid in wages they added 65 per cent. That 65 per cent meant that they added \$6.50 to every \$10—not necessarily for one man—making \$16.50, and they then added 10 per cent to that, making the figure of \$18.15 of which I have spoken. If my honourable friend is not satisfied with my statements, I would recommend him to go to the records of the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons, where he will find this evidence. Are we going to put up the Canadian tariff to bring in revenue to keep a company like that going in Canada? That is the question. My idea, honourable gentlemen, is that instead of putting up the tariff in order to get an undue revenue, the proper

course is for the Government to cut off some \$50,000,000 of the expenditures that are taking place in Canada—and I venture to say that could be done without the public interest suffering in the slightest degree. Some private pets to whom these contracts have been given might suffer, but the public of Canada would not suffer in the slightest degree.

There are other sources of expenditure that, in my judgment, might be cut off to very good advantage. Take, for instance, the lending of \$25,000,000 to Rumania at a time when the Government knew that Rumania was absolutely bankrupt. They gave that \$25,000,000—why? To enable certain manufacturers in Canada to contract for large quantities of supplies for Rumania. The Government put up the money and the manufacturer gets his big price and makes big profits, and when it comes to getting the money back we cannot even get the interest on it. The same remark applies to Greece. The Government was in exactly the same position as a merchant doing a credit business. A man comes in and says: "I want to buy \$1,000 worth of goods, but I haven't got any money. My farm has two or three mortgages on it; I have private debts; and, besides, everything I have chattel-mortgaged; but will you sell the goods to me on credit?" What would you think of a merchant who would say: "No, but I will tell you what I will do: I will go down to the bank with you and endorse your note for \$1,000, so that you can get the money and buy the goods." But the Government is in an even worse position than that, because they take all the risks and get nothing in return. The only benefit is that a few manufacturers are given contracts.

There is another way in which the Government has wasted a great deal of money. A year or two ago the Government engaged an outfit of Yankees to come over here to reform and reclassify our Civil Service. I must confess that when the Government took that position and promised to do away with political patronage I was favourably inclined to the proposal. I was a member of the House of Commons at that time, and thought that perhaps these people would do better than we had done; I really felt that the matter of appointments would be better out of our hands, and that we would have no bother with it. They got Young and Company to come here, and if ever there was a botch made of any piece of business on the face of the earth, it was