

Mr. DAVIS. I think I have the floor.

Mr. DAVIN. I think I should be allowed to read the sworn evidence.

Mr. DAVIS. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman—

Mr. DAVIN. I was not out of order.

Mr. DAVIS. I maintain that it would have been better to leave this question until all the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee had been taken and submitted to the House when we could discuss this question intelligently. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has seen fit to read a lot of statements that, so far as the House knows, have no foundation in fact. The House is not in a position to know whether he entered into a contract with Mr. Walter Scott for the completion of that work or not.

Mr. DAVIN. I have Mr. Scott's sworn evidence, in which he admits it.

Mr. DAVIS. The deputy minister states in the letter that there was no contract so far as he knew, that the work had been given to Mr. Scott after he had purchased this paper from the *Leader* Company and he was entitled to be paid. The \$175 was paid to the managing director of the *Leader* Company the cheque endorsed by that hon. gentleman, and, I suppose, the money went to him, and no work had been done when he sold out to another party. There is no agreement produced to show that he entered into an agreement with any party to do the work. The hon. gentleman may talk of a verbal agreement made on the street corner. He has no written agreement that we know of. This is a dispute between this hon. gentleman and Mr. Walter Scott, and the time of the House should not be taken up with that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) entered into a contract with the lieutenant-governor to do certain work, and before any work was done, before a scratch of the pen was made, the lieutenant-governor handed him \$175 of the public money; and the hon. gentleman takes that money, puts it in his pocket and sells out his paper to another party, who declares that he knows nothing about the payment made, that he had done the work and wanted to be paid for it. And the government, I suppose, has had to pay the party who did the work. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), in order to put himself right, should have handed back a cheque to the government for that money, and, if he had a grievance against Mr. Walter Scott, he could take the proper course to collect that \$175 from Mr. Scott. In the meantime, this should be left until the evidence is all brought down. The hon. gentleman has made what he calls a clear statement; but the House will not accept that statement, and the hon. gentleman will find that after the committee reports he will have to go into the evidence.

If he can clear his skirts afterwards, nobody will object. The idea of taking up half an hour of the time of the House when there is no evidence before it at all, I submit, is absurd.

Mr. DAVIN. This hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) tells us that we should not discuss it, this thing—and then proceeds to discuss it to an extent that I did not discuss it. He says that there was no agreement between me and Mr. Scott. Unfortunately, there was a written agreement—

Mr. DAVIS. What I said was that there was no written agreement before the House, and I think the House understood me. If there is an agreement it should be produced at the proper time.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) said, as though he was making a strong point, that there was no written agreement between me and Mr. Scott, meaning that if there was a written agreement it would have a binding effect upon Mr. Scott that an agreement by word of month would not have. I had the most solemn written agreement, for which good substantial value was given, that this man was to support me and the Conservative party for three years, that he was to give me an absolute control of the first two columns of the paper. Yet, in the face of an election, in the midst of the battle, he broke away from the agreement before twelve months had elapsed. What good would a written agreement be with a man like that? Was it an extraordinary thing, in regard to a paltry sum like this, that I should not have thought it necessary to make a written agreement with Mr. Scott? He was at that time in the most intimate relations with me that one could be with a public man. He was the editor of my organ, bound to me by solemn agreement; and up to that time and some time afterward, I could not find the least fault with him. It would be interesting to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) and others in this House to take up the *Leader* of that time and look at the articles written by Mr. Scott discussing me, and telling the public what his estimate of me was. I have had a good deal of flattery, as I have had a good deal of abuse; but his articles were about as warm and as eulogistic as any one who might desire praise or might think journalistic praise necessary to a public man could wish them to be. So, it was not unnatural that I should not have thought it necessary to have a written agreement in regard to so small a matter with a man who stood to me in such intimate relationship. This hon. gentleman also suggests that I should have handed a cheque. Why should I do it? Why should the *Leader* Company (Limited), do it if it did not owe it? To have done it would have been to acknowledge that it owed the money. Do you suppose that the *Leader* Company (Limited), was in