

letter from the Mortimer Company which the hon. member for Hastings read this afternoon. Now, Sir, when the hon. member read that letter, he asked, in a burst of simulated indignation, 'Is it possible to think that a firm would sign such a letter?' Certainly it is. There was nothing strange about that firm signing a letter of that kind. When the members of the firm and I got together and compared notes, and each found how the other had been deceived, there was nothing remarkable about it at all. It had been represented to the firm by Mr. Cook, in his great solicitude to protect the minister—and here I should tell the House that the statement made to the different firms was that the minister was having trouble with his colleagues about this contract—and some of my colleagues who are listening to me now are hearing about it for the first time—that as the contract was over \$5,000, the minister might be asked a question about it, and he wanted to fix up the file. And this gentleman, in order to assist his minister if you please, to carry out a dishonest transaction, extracted these prices from these different firms, and got the alleged tender from the Mortimer Company. What more natural than that the Mortimer Company, when they found out all the facts in their interview with me, were willing to write that letter, and gave it to me to place on file as I did in connection with the evidence given by Mr. Wm. Mortimer, and as it appears in the volume presented to the House in November last.

The hon. member for Hastings, in the course of his further observations, read my letter of the 27th of November, 1908, as it appears in this published report, and then drew attention to the fact that what he called the evidence as reported here was first taken in June, 1910, and from these two circumstances he deduced this argument, that either the minister failed to do anything between November, 1908, and June, 1910, or if he had done anything, then he had suppressed what had been done. Well, Mr. Speaker, that deduction was just as unfounded as all the rest of my hon. friend's speech. It suited my hon. friend's purpose to deal with this report as though it were something that was available to his hands for the purpose in which he was engaged to-day, but that it was not to serve any other purpose whatever. He would treat it as existent, or non-existent just as it suited his purpose. Well, Sir, I object to that use of this report; I put too much time upon it, I spent too many days and nights in its preparation, to allow it to be used in any such way; and while it may suit the purpose of my hon. friend to use a part of the report and ignore the great bulk of it, I do not intend

to let him escape with tactics of that kind. If he had taken the trouble to read this report, he would have found that on page 6 I had said this:

The measures adopted at different times within the last two years to effect reforms in the organization and methods of the Printing Bureau, to improve its relations with the other departments, and to secure the earlier publication of the annual reports for parliament, are indicated in the correspondence forming appendix 1 to this report.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister just there, if the part he is reading has any reference to any wrong-doing in the way of commissions, and so on, previous to his taking charge of the department; in other words, was there any evidence of wrong-doing during the time the Hon. Mr. Scott was minister of the department and Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. I can only say that the practices of which the late Superintendent of Stationery was without doubt guilty, had extended back for a period of at least a year or a year and a half prior to my entering the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). By that do I understand that the wrong-doing extended back only a year or a year and a half prior to the hon. minister taking charge of the department, and that it did not really take place during the time that Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. I regret that I cannot give my hon. friend definite information so far as dates are concerned. The only way in which we could arrive at a knowledge as to when these practices started was to trace back the beginnings of the dealings with those firms in New York which undoubtedly had dishonest relations with the late Superintendent of Stationery, and those dealings began about a year or a year and a half prior to my entering the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know if the minister, in the investigation he made, had any facts to prove that during the time Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department there was any commission paid or any crookedness of any kind.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Dawson was undoubtedly in charge during the year or the year and a half that those dishonest relations existed between the late Superintendent of Stationery and certain New York firms.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There was nothing prior to the one-and-a-half year.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not prepared to say that there was not prior to the year and a half.