

cerning them for various reasons. I will give them to the leader of the House or the leader of the Opposition if they want them. It is absolutely straight; they can easily perceive why I could not give them. These experts gave us the benefit of their assistance and the price of ammunition was reduced from \$37.50 to \$33 per thousand, the cheapest ammunition by several dollars per thousand that has been contracted for during the history of the war.

On another matter, that of motor trucks, this gentleman also stepped in at my request. It was he who brought me first in touch with Mr. Beecroft and Colonel Thomas. Through association with these two gentlemen and himself our motor trucks are delivered to-day at \$2,800 each, and I know of no trucks in the British Empire than can be obtained at less than list price less 10 per cent. Ours are list price less 25 per cent. At any rate, the price which we paid to the British Government for 51 trucks of the same quality as our own was \$5,240 each. So that, whatever his faults may be—and I do not know that he has many more than some of the rest of us—he has at all events been instrumental in saving some money to the taxpayers of the British Empire.

On the question of Colts revolvers and pistols, let me point out how he assisted. In 1899 and 1900, the Auditor General's Report shows—and I am not finding fault with what was done then, but, oh, my! how the welkin would ring if, instead of getting our Colts revolvers to-day at \$14, we had paid \$15.50 for them, \$1.50 going to Colonel J. Wesley Allison; and what a wail would have been set up if, instead of paying \$18.50 for Colts revolvers, \$1.50 had been added to that price and the total had been \$20, \$1.50 going to J. Wesley Allison or any other agent! There would have been a wail from one end of this country to the other. But the lowest price was the price at which orders for pistols were placed by Colonel J. Wesley Allison. His statement to the head of the Colts firm, in my presence, was that not one cent must be added to the cost of these pistols over the lowest possible net price, for any commissions or any rake-off or anything of the kind, and not one cent has been added to the cost of these pistols. They stand to-day at \$14, the same pistols as my hon. friend opposite paid \$15.50 for in 1900. They stand to-day at \$18.50, and I challenge the universe to show one of these revolvers that has been

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

sold for one cent less than \$18.50 to any Government excepting the Government of the United States, which has an agreement to that effect. We are told that the trade can get them for \$14.50. It is well known that the public, the trade, cannot get them in the Dominion of Canada or in any other country outside of the United States for \$14.50 or \$15; they must pay duty. And, coming into Canada, with the duty added, that revolver stand at \$19.50 instead of at the figure quoted by my hon. friend. Sir, \$10.50 is the cost price for that pistol in Canada, and \$18.50 is the price at which it was sold to the Canadian Government, to the French Government, to the Russian Government. 200,000 of them were sold to the Russian Government at \$18.50.

And now, if my hon. friend the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) will permit me, I shall refer to his summary at the conclusion of his address, as containing all that is worthy of comment or recognition in his remarks. He speaks of the Shell Committee having given contracts to themselves. He instances the Bertram Company. I need only point to page 1818 of Hansard, where my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) completely refutes his argument in that regard, and shows that General Bertram had nothing to do with it. It is also shown on page 1818 that the Chapman Engine and Manufacturing Company, which is charged by the hon. member for Carleton with being subsidiary to the Bertram Company, has nothing to do with it. It is also charged that the Valley City Seating Company is subsidiary to the Bertram Company, and on page 1818 that statement is also exposed and refuted. Then it was also charged that the Universal Tool Steel Company, of which Mr. Watts is a member, was in the same position, and at page 1820 it is explained that there is not one particle of fact in that assertion. Then it was asserted that the Electric Steel and Metals Company had Mr. Carnegie as a director. I believe that is a mistake, and that they have put in the wrong Carnegie. But at page 1602 and 1805 that is also satisfactorily explained and any suggestion of impropriety refuted.

Then it is said that the Nova Scotia Steel Company was given contracts through Colonel Cantley. Let me say one word for Colonel Cantley—not of apology; he does not need it, nor does his concern need it. When this matter came up, when the manufacturers who had undertaken to make the few shells we had then on order looked into