

5,000 copies edition of "Thompson's History of England" at 40 per cent. discount from the present price. Could also furnish several other works at an equal reduction.

Under these circumstances what should hinder us from paddling our own canoe? Our city booksellers are now retailing some of our school books ten per cent. lower than the Toronto prices quoted. There is no cause why we should import school books even from Ontario. We can produce them at lower figures in St. John than the Toronto publishers have offered to furnish them, besides saving the expense and delay incurred by importation.

#### The Government Printing Contracts.

The libel suit between the Toronto *Globe* and Mr. Boyle, of the *Irish Canadian* has been brought to a close by the jury giving a unanimous verdict in favor of the defendant. This exposure of the jobbery done in government printing is timely and we hope will be effective. The *Globe* is certainly entitled to the gratitude of every right-thinking man in the Dominion for its bold stand in the cause of public right, honesty and justice. The circumstances, as they come to us through the daily press, are as follows:—The plaintiff in the suit against the *Globe* was Mr. Patrick Boyle, the publisher of the Toronto *Irish Canadian*, who was charged with having been bribed by MacLean, Roger & Co., for the sum of \$3,000, to withdraw his tender for their benefit. It appears that there were nine tenders, in all, for the public printing, of which that of Mr. C. H. Mackintosh, of the Ottawa *Citizen*, and Mayor of Ottawa, was the lowest. Next to him was the tender of James Hope, then E. J. Charlton, then J. C. Boyce & Co., then Patrick Boyle, the plaintiff, and then MacLean, Roger & Co. The latter, who had done most of the public printing for the five years previous, had a large stock of type suitable for the business, and it was an object to them to retain the contract if possible. It was to aid them in effecting this object that Mackintosh & Charlton put in tenders, neither of the offers to do the public printing put in by these persons being genuine, and, according to the evidence given at the trial, the figures at which they offered to contract being lower than the work could be properly done for. As to Boyle's tender, he had no type or plant sufficient to carry out such a contract, and could not have procured the necessary plant for less than \$20,000, a fact which will enable the reader to judge whether his offer was genuine or not. The contract was

awarded to Mr. Mackintosh, but he withdrew his tender in consideration, as he himself admitted, of the payment of \$12,000. Charlton was more generous and withdrew his tender without receiving any consideration therefor. Hope got \$1,450 after "a good deal of haggling," and we are not told what Boyce received. At all events, all these people withdrew their tenders, and MacLean, Roger & Co. got the contract. Mr. Boyle, it would seem, did not receive the \$3,000 which he tried for and expected to get; but a Mr. Cotton, a broker acting for Boyle, kept all of it he could get his hands on, including a suit of clothes, a present from MacLean, Roger & Co. Cotton obtained a letter from Boyle withdrawing his tender and received for it a check for \$500, made by MacLean, Roger & Co., in favor of E. J. Charlton, and endorsed by the latter to him, and five promissory notes for \$500, also made by MacLean, Roger & Co., in favor of Charlton and endorsed to Cotton. The latter at the trial stated that he took the money for his own benefit, and not for Boyle; and it is not surprising that after such a revelation of the manner in which the money was appropriated, MacLean, Roger & Co. have given notice that the three notes not yet paid were obtained by false pretences and without consideration, and will not be paid. The Toronto *Globe* thus concludes an article on the subject:

The men who made money by withdrawing their tenders for the printing contract gained at the expense of the public from MacLean, Roger & Co. While it is impossible to defend the conduct of the latter firm, it must be said in palliation of their offence that they were placed in a very hard position. They either had to get the contract or submit to an enormous loss in selling their expensive plant, much of it useful only to the public printer. While we condemn them for leagueing with rogues, we can pity the weakness which caused them to avoid ruin by grossly improper methods. They were only less guilty than Sir Hugh Allan, who purchased a charter merely to increase his wealth, while they bought a contract, without which they would have lost the honest earnings of years. He and they alike expected to get their money back from the public purse.

We would not say that the present government are specially to blame in this case, for the evil is not of such recent and sudden growth. But we cannot understand why they did not hold on to the sums deposited as security to be forfeited in case the contract was refused by the one to whom it was awarded. We understand the