

other employee who questioned him about it was a man he did not like who was making himself officious in and about the Bureau, and he answered as he did simply because he did not recognize the right of this man to question him; and added unreservedly, that, of course, the notice applied to him as to others, and he felt himself bound by it. And I may say for the benefit of the hon. member from East Hastings and of any other hon. gentleman who might be disposed to raise such a question that the French Canadian employees in the Printing Bureau will compare very favourably indeed with any other class who work in that institution.

The hon. gentleman also quoted some evidence given in the report tending to show that political pull existed in the Printing Bureau. He referred to a question and answer appearing at page 237 in which the names of three employees are given and an expression of opinion is given by the witness that these men presumed a good deal upon political pull. That was a mere expression of opinion, because as a matter of fact, there is no such thing as political pull in vogue in the Printing Bureau.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY. I make that assertion with the knowledge that, not one but several of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House know that it is perfectly true, they having had personal experience in that regard since I assumed charge of the Printing Bureau. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to read the report of Mr. E. G. O'Connor regarding the lithographic room and Mr. Cook's connection with it, and said that if Mr. Cook was to blame some one above was responsible, and no one had been punished. There again he is incorrect. The man above Mr. Cook was responsible, and he was punished. I gave his name a few minutes ago, the late Superintendent of Printing, Mr. McMahon. But there is this to be said in this connection—that Mr. Cook, on his own admission repeated, not once but several times in the evidence, ignored the Superintendent of Printing and professed to deal with the King's Printer direct, although the Superintendent of Printing was, by Mr. Cook's own acknowledgment, his superior officer. When that sort of a relation existed in an establishment of this kind, it is not surprising that irregularities happened, and that Mr. Cook did some of the things that have been already communicated to the House and others of which I will tell the House before I take my seat. But, Sir, in this connection my hon. friend should have read further, and he should have had the fairness to tell the House that in the same report from which he quoted, that of Mr.

E. G. O'Connor appearing at pages 147-8-9-50 of the report, it is stated by Mr. O'Connor that the practices therein disclosed for which Mr. Cook above all other officials in the Bureau was chiefly responsible, had been stopped, as reported at the top of page 150:

These absurd prices appear to have been paid for years without protest by Mr. Cook or any other official until I called attention to it during my inquiry, and, by your authority, had it stopped.

Then my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) dilated at considerable length upon the list of purchases to be found in the Auditor General's Report and referred to the evidence given in the Public Accounts Committee in connection with several of these purchases. It is true these purchases are extensive, but they are not Bureau purchases—that is, not in the sense that these goods are intended for the Bureau. The Bureau, as is well known, makes purchases for all the departments of government and for parliament as well. My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) did not allege that anything wrong was shown in connection with these purchases. He rather dwelt upon the number of them and expressed the view that all these goods could not have been required. No evidence was given to that effect, so I fail to see in what regard the citation of these purchases assists in any particular the position taken by my hon. friend.

The hon. gentleman also referred to a return that has been more or less discussed, which was prepared in response to an order passed at the instance of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). In connection with that return he chose to animadvert somewhat severely upon the bona fides of the present under Secretary of State, Mr. Muivey, and having given his version of how that return had been prepared stated that if Mr. Muivey had been honest and intelligent he would not have prepared it in the manner described by my hon. friend. I hold no brief for Mr. Muivey. Mr. Muivey's character is such that it is not necessary for any hon. gentleman to hold a brief for him, but I may say that there is no man more honest and there are few men as intelligent and zealous in the service of Canada as Mr. Muivey. That is a reputation which he did not need to come to Ottawa to make; he enjoyed it while in the service of the Ontario government, both under the Ross administration and under the present Whitney administration. Having said that much in reference to Mr. Muivey, let me say further that this return was asked for in the Public Accounts Committee. When it was asked for, I informed the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I think one other hon. gen-