

stituents have over and over again given their verdict, because a newspaper contained an article which I did not write, or inspire, which I did not even know of and have not read, the hon. gentleman resurrects slanders and cries against me which had grown stale owing to the lapse of years. The hon. gentleman talked about a paper being held by a Minister of the Crown, and held under mortgage. I am not aware that any Minister of the Crown, since I have been connected with the *Citizen*—I can almost state positively that no Minister of the Crown ever—had a mortgage on or a dollars' worth of interest in the stock of the *Citizen* Company. If the contention of the hon. member for North Brant is correct, if his statement that we, the Conservative publishers or controllers of Conservative newspapers, can go to the Departments day after day, or week after week, and draw large sums of money from the Government, is correct, how is it, as he represents, that the *Ottawa Citizen*, which he says I control, is in such an unhappy condition as he says it is, and has been over and over again? How can he reconcile the statement he makes with the further statement that the *Ottawa Citizen* has been in *extremis*? The fact that the paper is in that position is proof positive that the Government has not dealt generously, or with sufficient generosity, towards the papers that support it. I have never asked a questionable favor from the Government, directly or indirectly, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite—any one of them or any number of them—to show that, since I entered Parliament, I have been guilty of one action which would stain my escutcheon as a politician, or bring the blush of shame to the faces of my constituents. Until they can fight me on my parliamentary record, it is unfair and unjust for the hon. member for North Brant to make such an attack upon me. I have never yet taken notice of the slanders heaped on me by newspapers, and my time is too valuable and too precious to waste it in writing articles even on the profound member for North Brant. I have endeavored to live on terms of amity with hon. members. I have never personally written an article in reference to one of them. If I have anything to say in regard to any of them, I will say it to his face.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has alluded to me, I will say that I did state the facts of his connection with the printing contract, and I may say that I intend, from time to time, to recite those facts, and I would recommend the hon. gentleman, before he fulfils his intention of repeating the operation, as he says he would do on any occasion that offered, to study the Act for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys, which has been passed since the last transaction to which he refers.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. So far as advice given me by the hon. member for West Durham is concerned when backed by a statutory provision, I may be inclined to consider it, but, if it were tendered on his own biased political opinion, I would be the last man to accept it. The hon. gentleman must not imagine that I was not aware of that Act in relation to fraud. I said that, under similar circumstances, if I were a private individual, I would do the very same thing; and, when he speaks of the printing contract, let me say that the *Ottawa Free Press*, when I had voluntarily made my statement without being called upon to do so, because I had nothing to be ashamed of, in its issue of January 29th, 1880, said:

"We publish to-day the evidence of Mr. Mackintosh, given in the case *Boyle vs. The Globe*, and the explanation given by him, corroborated by Mr. Roger, seems to put a different aspect upon the printing contract controversy, in so far as Mr. Mackintosh is concerned. It appears from Mr. Mackintosh's evidence, Messrs. Maclean Roger & Co., entered into an agreement with him some weeks before the tenders went in that he should join and not compete against them for the parliamentary printing. Mr. Mackintosh's interest to be settled in proportion to the amount of the contract if awarded to them. This arrangement it appears was carried out, Messrs. Maclean, Roger & Co., ultimately purchasing Mr.

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

Mackintosh's interest and not his tender, as was generally understood until now. The evidence seems to exonerate him from the allegations heretofore made, and under the circumstances we now deem it but just to place Mr. Mackintosh's position in a fair light, being neither desirous of doing an injury nor misrepresenting any of the parties more directly interested."

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman for some reason or other has thought proper to bring my name in here. He has stated as a fact that I was a contract printer. I was not a contract printer in any way.

An hon. MEMBER. A contract broker.

Mr. VAIL. Nor a contract broker. I had nothing to do with the printing and never received a dollar directly or indirectly from the Government or anybody else, in this House or outside of it, in connection with any printing contract. I do not know why the hon. gentleman wanted to drag my name in, unless he desired to drag me down to his own level.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It appears by what the hon. member for Ottawa has said, that an injustice was done him in attributing to him the authorship of the article referred to in the House yesterday. I am glad to know that the member for Ottawa was in a position to say that it is only at certain seasons of the year that he is editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*—that during the Session of Parliament, the most important of the different seasons of the year, when the most important discussions take place, he vacates the editorial chair. At the same time, he is the responsible editor of the paper, and he must be held responsible for what appears in that paper. I do not see how he can escape the responsibility for what appears in the *Citizen*. The hon. member for Ottawa, and the editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*, has a right to say what he thinks proper in regard to the member for North Brant, and to criticise the acts of the representatives of the people. I am glad to know that the member for Ottawa has an inward consciousness of his innocence in regard to those things which have been matters of history in the past, which have been referred to in the courts, which the judges of the land have taken cognisance of; but I think it will take a great deal of this inward consciousness that he professes to have to satisfy the public that he had nothing to do with contract broking in connection with the printing contracts some years ago. I will not say anything further except that every gentleman who comes here to represent a constituency has a duty to perform, and, in discharging that duty, he need not care for the frowns or the praises of any journal, no matter what its party politics may be. I have been too long used to the abuse heaped upon the Reformers of the country by the Conservative press to heed what is said either by the *Ottawa Citizen* or by any other Conservative paper. Any one on this side who discharges his duty must expect to be traduced by the organs of the Government. I anticipated that, and I would have been a little disappointed if that had not been meted out to me. I have therefore nothing to say with regard to that. So far, however, as the *Ottawa Citizen* is concerned, I have had a note sent to me just now informing me that it is at the present time in the hands of the tax-collectors. That verifies the statement I made yesterday, and the member for Ottawa is indignant that I should make any such statement when the facts are just what I said. He argues that the poverty of the *Citizen* shows that it does not receive a very large share of Government patronage, but in my opinion this only verifies the truth of the old saying that ill-gotten gains never stick. I say these Tory journals can never expect to prosper, or make money as long as they live, as they do, upon the droppings from the Government table. I say that no man who conducts a journal in such a way as that, and who depends upon the offerings of the Government, can possibly conduct an impartial newspaper in the public interest.