

“ That the second and third Resolutions are in direct violation of the principle upon which the contract was awarded to Mr. *Taylor*, his Tender being accepted by the House, contrary to the recommendation of the Printing Committee, solely on the ground that it was \$1,775.99 cents less on one year's work, or \$8,879.95 cents on the five years' contract, than the Tender of *Hunter, Rose and Lemieux*, who had long and satisfactorily performed the work ; whereas, the present recommendation of increased prices, which is retro-active, commencing with the Session of 1871, gives Mr. *Taylor* about \$8,000 in excess of his contract on one year's work on the large sum of \$32,000 on the four years provided for—an amount about \$12,000 more than his claim for double composition.”

“ It is therefore, the opinion of this House, that the Report should not be concurred in, but that if Mr. *Taylor* desires it, he be relieved of his contract, and the work re-let by Public Tender,” inserted instead thereof ;

Mr. *Daly* moved, in amendment to the said proposed amendment, seconded by Mr. *Keeler*, That the words “ the first Resolution of the Fifth Report of the Printing Committee establishes the principle, that it is equitable, after a Contract has been entered into, to advance the prices thereof, which if once admitted by Parliament, will affect the whole system of letting Public Works by Tender—a principle most dangerous at the present moment when the Dominion is engaged in large Public Works, the contractors for which will have like claims for increased prices ; and especially dangerous in view of the *Pacific* Railway and other extensive contracts ahead to be entered into, for the precedent once established, a direct inducement will be held out to tenderers to give in low tenders to get possession of Works, trusting to real or supposed equitable claims to obtain advanced prices.

“ That the second and third Resolutions are in direct violation of the principle upon which the contract was awarded to Mr. *Taylor*, his Tender being accepted by the House contrary to the recommendation of the Printing Committee, solely on the ground that it was \$1,775.99 cents less on one year's work, or \$8,879.95 cents on the five years' contract, than the Tender of *Hunter, Rose and Lemieux*, who had long and satisfactorily performed the work ; whereas, the present recommendation of increased prices, which is retro-active, commencing with the Session of 1871, gives Mr. *Taylor* about \$8,000 in excess of his contract on one years' work on the large sum of \$32,000 on the four years provided for—an amount about \$12,000 more than his claim for double composition.

“ It is therefore, the opinion of this House, that the Report should not be concurred in, but that if Mr. *Taylor* desires it, he be relieved of his contract, and the work re-let by Public Tender,” be left out, and the words “ the rates of the Parliamentary Printing Contract be advanced to the same ratio as those of the printing trade generally as reported by the Queen's Printer, namely twenty-seven per cent,” inserted instead thereof ;

And the Question being put on the amendment to the said proposed amendment ; the House divided : and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

<i>Archambeault,</i>	<i>Caron,</i>	<i>Dewdney,</i>	<i>Glass,</i>
<i>Baby,</i>	<i>Chisholm,</i>	<i>Dormer,</i>	<i>Grover,</i>
<i>Baker,</i>	<i>Church,</i>	<i>Dugas,</i>	<i>Harwood,</i>
<i>Beaubien,</i>	<i>Gluxton,</i>	<i>Duguay,</i>	<i>Keeler,</i>
<i>Bellerose,</i>	<i>Colby,</i>	<i>Flesher,</i>	<i>Killam,</i>
<i>Bowell,</i>	<i>Cunningham,</i>	<i>Fortin,</i>	<i>Kirkpatrick,</i>
<i>Brooks,</i>	<i>Currier,</i>	<i>Gendron,</i>	<i>Lacerte,</i>
<i>Burpee (St. John),</i>	<i>Daly,</i>	<i>Gibbs (Ont., N.R.),</i>	<i>Langevin,</i>
<i>Campbell,</i>	<i>DeCosmos,</i>	<i>Gibbs (Ont., S.R.),</i>	<i>Langlois,</i>