

The officials made the necessary calculations and reduced all the bids to a basis of the price per bomb with sales tax included. On this basis, it was found that the Interprovincial Equipment Company of Ottawa was lowest. Their price was \$2.64 per bomb, which represented a cost to the Department of \$32,474 for the number of bombs required. The next lowest tender was \$2.65, which was one cent higher per bomb, but represented an extra cost to the Department of \$123.

The kind of misrepresentation indulged in by the Financial Post is exemplified by the fact that they represented the difference between the two lowest tenders to be one cent. Whereas, the difference to the taxpayer was actually \$123.

On the face of the Interprovincial Equipment Company's tender was inscribed a notation to the effect that if this tender were accepted there would be a sub-contract.

Departmental Officials, without consulting the Minister, considered that this circumstance required further investigation. Accordingly, the Company was asked for information.

It was learned that the Interprovincial Equipment Company did not have a manufacturing plant of its own, but that it had a working arrangement of long standing with a manufacturing company in Montreal, The Engineering Products Limited. It was learned that these two companies had together carried out a number of other Government contracts satisfactorily.

Dun and Bradstreet's reported that the members of the Interprovincial Company controlled assets worth \$100,000, and that their credit was good.

The Engineering Products Limited was found to be a substantial and well known manufacturing concern in Montreal fully capable of carrying out this contract.

Upon these facts being ascertained, the officers of the department, again without reference to the Minister, concluded that the special circumstances did not warrant any departure from the normal sound governmental practice of accepting the lowest price offered, which price involved a saving of \$123. to the taxpayers as compared with the next lowest bid.

The recommendation to Council recited in detail the exact price offered by every one of the 29 bidders and recommended that the lowest tender be accepted.

It may be true that the partners in this company were insurance men. It may be true that they were interested in politics. Both are respectable occupations. Neither fact had anything to do with the award of this contract.

The officials did their duty. They took the lowest bidder.

They ascertained by investigation that he was financially reliable and that he could deliver the goods.

No charge of political favoritism can stand in the face of these facts.