

The intrusion of parliamentary committees into matters which pertain to the jurisdiction of the executive government is equally to be deprecated as it tends inevitably to overthrow all genuine responsibility.

Now, the principle laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister, sustained by the author whom I have just quoted and approved by this House, has been applied by me to the Printing Bureau. And still, it seems, our friends opposite are not satisfied. However, that is not to be wondered at. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be found to be consistent chiefly in their inconsistency. Speaking in the debate in 1909, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), referring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, said:

It would be unreasonable to find fault with the minister or the government if the minister, on ascertaining the wrong-doing, or at the time when he should have ascertained it with ordinary vigilance, had dismissed the wrong-doer and punished him as the law provides.

And yet, in the present instance, for having done the very thing that the hon. member for West Elgin indicated, the government is now brought to book by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who I have no doubt will expect his political friends and associates to support him in presenting this motion. I do not know whether it is too much to expect, but, having regard to consistency I might be pardoned for saying that the hon. member for West Elgin at least should oppose the motion of the hon. member for East Hastings, and vote with this side of the House because, in the present case, I have followed precisely the line he laid down in 1909 when discussing the affairs of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Let me run over some of the citations made by the hon. member for East Hastings in support of this motion, and deal briefly with certain arguments that he advanced in presenting them to the House. Let me premise by pointing out that everything the hon. gentleman has mentioned in support of his motion has been taken from the report which is before parliament or from the evidence adduced before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. NORTHURUP. Quite incorrect.

Mr. MURPHY. The hon. gentleman has announced nothing new. I made very full notes of what he said. He did not mention a single thing with which I was not perfectly familiar by reason of the facts elicited in the inquiry into the Department of Printing and Stationery. And, so far as that department is concerned, he did not cite a single case requiring attention that had not been attended to as a result of the inquiry I conducted, beginning nearly two

years and a half ago, into the affairs of that department. At the outset, the hon. gentleman propounded a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. He cited a number of deeds of commission and omission on the part of officials in the Printing Bureau, and asked the Prime Minister whether, if he could prove these things, the Prime Minister would grant an inquiry. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman merely made a summary of what I had brought out in that investigation. Every word uttered was taken bodily from the report which has been before parliament since November last. I challenge him or any other hon. gentleman on that side to dispute my statement.

Mr. NORTHURUP. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murphy) ever heard of the Auditor General's Report? I quoted very fully from that.

Mr. MURPHY. I will come to the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. NORTHURUP. The hon. gentleman should not make the statement he is making.

Mr. MURPHY. In making that statement, I am supported by the facts. I am confining myself to the list of deeds of commission and omission which was cited by the hon. member at the beginning of his speech, when he propounded a question to the Prime Minister, and asked him to say whether, if these things were proven, he, the Prime Minister, would grant an inquiry. That is what I am dealing with, and I repeat, in regard to that, that every word uttered by the hon. member was found in the report which has been before parliament since November last. Therefore, how ridiculous it is on the part of the hon. member to cite matters which are now ancient history, to rise in this House and propound such a question to the Prime Minister as if what he proposed to cite was the result of labours of his own and to ask whether, in the event of his being able to prove these things an inquiry would be granted. Why, all these things were proven in the course of my investigation. That is the only way the hon. gentleman knew about them. Never by any industry or assiduity of his own could he have found them out. He comes here and poses before you and the House, and gravely asks if an inquiry will be granted on these things being proven. Why, Sir, not only have these things been discovered, but the people guilty of them have been punished, and the wrong practices that prevailed in connection with them have been stopped. There is absolutely no support for the position taken by the hon. member this afternoon except that indicated by the newspapers that support him namely,