

APPENDIX No. 1

'50,000 No. 8 envelopes, packing boxes	30—30 x 16 x 16.
'50,000 No. 9 " " "	25—36 x 20 x 20.
'50,000 No. 10 " " "	25—25 x 14 x 14.
'50,000 No. 11 " " "	10—30 x 10 x 10.
'50,000 No. 12 " " "	10—30 x 7 x 7.

'12 doz. No. (6) scratch pads.

'Approved by board, September 28, 1905.

P. D. RYAN,
'Secretary.'

Q. This requisition includes everything, does it?—A. Yes.

Q. This requisition apparently calls for 250,000 envelopes?—A. That is right, sir.

Q. The transaction with Barber & Ellis was for one-half of that?—A. For one-half of that, sir.

Q. From whom did you purchase the other half of those articles?—A. From the La Cie d'Imp. du Bulletin du Travail, of Quebec.

Q. You purchased them from the Imperial Bulletin of Labour, of Quebec—I do not want to go into that at present?—A. Yes.

Q. This requisition having been approved by the board, what did you do?—A. Very shortly after it was adopted the representative of the Munroe Commission Company was in my office, or rather previous to that Charles Davidson, the representative of the Rolland Paper Mills Company, called at my office and wished to quote on envelopes and gave me a price. Mr. O'Gorman, of the Munroe Commission Company, being in shortly afterwards, I offered him the envelopes at the price quoted by the Rolland Paper Mills Company—

Q. First of all you say that the Rolland Paper Mills Company, through their agent, Mr. Davidson, came to you, in your office, and made a bid for these 125,000 envelopes?—A. Well, he gave me a quotation on it.

Q. Was the quotation for the 125,000 or for the 250,000?—A. For the 125,000.

Q. Had you any reason for dividing the bid?—A. No particular reason any more than that a portion of the business should go to Quebec; Ontario gets nearly all of it, and we try to send a little to Quebec.

Q. The only reason for dividing it into two quantities was that you wanted Quebec and Ontario each to get a fair share?—A. That was one of the reasons, yes, sir.

Q. When the Rollands made you a bid, where were they from?—A. From Montreal.

Q. Was that the reason you did not buy from them?—A. They had refused to sell us paper on a previous occasion.

Q. When was that?—A. On January 10, 1905.

Q. You say they had refused to sell paper to you?—A. Yes, they referred us to their agents here, they would not sell to us direct.

Q. You call that a refusal?—A. Well, it is a refusal—I might say their agents for paper to whom they referred us here in Ottawa are Mortimer & Co.

Q. Instead of dealing directly with you they referred you to their local agent here in Ottawa?—A. Yes.

Q. And you consider that a refusal to deal with you?—A. It was a refusal to deal direct with us, we had to deal with an agent or middleman.

Q. You did not believe in dealing with a middleman, that was very proper, I entirely agree with you?—A. I did not say that I did not believe in dealing with a middleman, I must deal with middlemen, because the manufacturers will not deal direct with us.

Q. You considered it a refusal when they refused to deal with you direct and referred you to their agent?—A. I considered it a refusal to deal direct with us—I had to deal with a middleman.