

return your deposit. I say what should have been done by the hon. gentleman, as hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious that Canadian labour, enterprise and skill shall be assisted in this country, was when the essential conditions of the specifications were ignored by the American Company, to have asked the British American Bank Note Company and the Barber-Ellis Company whether they had any propositions to make. The hon. gentleman did not do it. He simply cavalierly ignored the establishment which has done work since 1868 to the satisfaction of the Dominion, and he never opened communication with that company until he had received and accepted an irregular tender and had committed himself to the American Company. When that occurred Mr. Burland, as president of the British Bank Note Company, wrote to the Minister and asked for an interview, at the same time asking whether a plan he was prepared to submit could not be admitted; and stating that rather than the work should go out of Canada, he would be prepared to do it in his own establishment at the same rates as those offered by the American Bank Note Company. This was on 15th January, and at that time there was no Order in Council passed, and there was no contract entered into, there was no purchase by the new company, there was nothing to prevent the Finance Minister at that period of the negotiations accepting the offer of the British American Bank Note Company at the reduced rates, thus allowing the work to be done here in Canada. My hon. friend the Finance Minister will argue: I could not honourably do that. Why not? If the Barber-Ellis tender was ruled out for informality, much more should he have ruled out the American Bank Note Company's tender for informality. The only formal tender was that of the British American Bank Note Company. The hon. gentleman ignored that, and entered into communications with the other company. The contract was not authorized to be executed by Council until April 5th, and the contract was not indentured until March 9th, whilst on January 15th Mr. Burland's offer on behalf of the British American Bank Note Company, was before the Minister, offering to do the work at the same rate as those offered by the American Bank Note Company. There is another phase of the question. What is that? What was mentioned by the Deputy Minister of Finance. It is true that on the fact of it the tender for the work was \$128,000 by the British American Bank Note Company, and \$99,900 odd by the American Bank Note Company, but that does not take into account the charge for engraving. What is meant by that? Simply this. If the British American Bank Note Company's tender had been accepted, every die which was necessary for

Mr. FOSTER

the printing of the bank notes of the revenue stamps and postage stamps, having been made and stored, and being to-day in store in that establishment, would not have cost the Government a single cent. When the old company is thrown aside and the new company comes in, the latter has to recoup itself for the engraving of every bank note and revenue and postage stamp, and so they have to be paid at high rates for engraving the dies and making plates. What does that amount to? It reaches a large sum. Let me point out this fact. The American Bank Note Company has obtained this contract on the ground of paying a less amount for workmanship. Let us see how the figures stand. Here is a statement showing the difference in cost of engraving between the American Company and British American Bank Note Company:

	American Prices.	Brit. Am. Prices.
\$1 Notes—		
Face plate.....	\$ 250 00	\$ 300 00
Back	125 00	100 00
Retouching, one-half price	187 50	200 00
Tint plates for patent green	687 50	412 50
	<u>1,250 00</u>	<u>\$1,012 50</u>

Difference in cost of engraving 9 sets of plates, per annum, \$2,137.50.

Difference in cost of engraving five and one-quarter years' supply, \$11,221.38.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Take the engraving and printing together.

Mr. FOSTER. I am dealing with the matter in my own way, and I leave it to the House to say whether I am treating it fairly or not. What does the hon. Minister of Finance consider unfair?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not complain; but the hon. gentleman is taking one part of the work, which happens to be at low prices and makes a comparison with higher prices for that particular class of work. He should take all branches of the work together, and give the House the total sum. That is what we have to deal with.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman object to my taking a different course?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman does not take the total.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask my hon. friend if he will allow his hon. friend to finish his statement. I propose to do this in my own way, for the sake of conciseness. I am only afraid I will not be able to bring out everything.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid you will not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then as regards \$2 and \$4 notes, the following are the figures—