

head of the department. Why, in every line of that he points out the danger, he points out the suspicious character of this tender, he does everything that a man can do to show that he disapproved profoundly of the change that was about to be made. I say that a graver act of injustice, not only to the British American Bank Note Company, but to the Canadian people, in my judgment, the hon. gentleman could not have perpetrated in connection with the mode, the illegal mode, in which he has dealt with this subject of tender and of contract, than is disclosed by the statements which have been placed before the House and by those papers which he himself has laid on the Table. I say that if the hon. gentleman had wished to destroy the whole system of tender and of contract, to destroy its sacredness, to prevent its being regarded as a safety to the people; if the hon. gentleman had wished to sweep away all the safeguards that surround that most important question of tender and of contract, he could not have adopted any means more thorough than those he has adopted in the treatment of this question. The hon. gentleman, instead of having accepted the lowest tender, had no lowest tender. If Mr. Burland could have obtained access to him, I say an offer would have been made long before in order to save his property from destruction and confiscation at the hands of the hon. gentleman, and to protect himself from the injustice which was about to be done him, and by this offer he would not only have saved a large amount of public money, but he would have preserved inviolate that system of tender and of contract which, for a country like Canada, with its enormous public works and its enormous transactions, is of the most vital importance to the people of Canada.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not flatter myself that I can say anything new on this question, as the ground has been covered so fully by the previous speakers, especially by the ex-Minister of Finance. But there are one or two points to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, and which seem to me of some little importance. I shall not go over the facts stated by the ex-Minister of Finance about the contract held so long by the British American Bank Note Company, and executed by them to the satisfaction of the Government, and I think to the satisfaction of the country. I find that previous to 1886 the work was done in the city of Montreal, but in that year a new contract was entered into, the provisions of which compelled the contractor to have the work done in Ottawa. Of necessity he had to erect here a building and bring machinery here, necessitating a large expenditure on his part. That is a point which I think we should bear in mind. The British American Bank Note Company had to go to a considerable expense in

1886, not so very long ago, in erecting this fine building in the city of Ottawa. We are told that there is a capital of \$400,000 invested in that business. I want to say that provision was made that all the work pertaining to that contract had to be done in the city of Ottawa; there was no exception, none of the work was allowed to be done in the city of Montreal at all. Previous to that the work had been done there, but now the contractor has to do all the work in the city of Ottawa. Now, this contractor, in order to do all this work in the city of Ottawa, had not only to erect a substantial building costing a large amount of money, had not only to purchase and put into that building fine machinery, but he had to get skilled workmen, he had to bring them to the city of Ottawa, and no doubt at great expense. He had not only to bring them here, but he had to train other men in this city to take their places and to do part of this work. Well, this contract lasted for five years, and in 1892 another contract was entered into. We find that this second contract was taken at a considerable reduction in price compared with the previous contract, that additional security was given for safety, and for taking care of and guarding the work that was done, for the safety of the plates, &c., and this contract was in force until April 23rd, 1897.

We are told that in April, 1896, the British American Bank Note Company applied to the late Government, and said they wished to add some more machinery and make improvements in their building, and before doing so they wanted to ascertain whether they would obtain a renewal of the contract for a further term of five years after the contract had expired. I was a little surprised at the Finance Minister speaking of this company as he did, and talking about them as if they thought they had a monopoly of this contract, and as if under the old Government they had such a monopoly. What do we find? Instead of the old Government entertaining that proposition for a renewal of the contract, they declared, after considering the matter, that they were not prepared to consider any renewal of the contract until its expiration in April, 1897. So the late Government is not open to the charge of favouring the British American Company. If they were open to such a charge and desired to favour that company, that was the time to have done it; but they absolutely refused to do so and allowed the contract to run to its expiration, and at that time the Government had changed. The Finance Minister gave six months' notice to the British American Company, which was necessary under the contract, and called for tenders. Particular attention should be given to the terms of the new tenders. It is all very well to argue that words do not mean what they apparently express; but in looking over the conditions of the tenders