

# THE JARVIS RECORD.

FRANK N PETTIT,

EDITOR & PROPRIETOR.

## SUBSCRIPTIONS

Per Year	\$1.00.
Six Months	75.
Three Months	40.
Single Copies	5.

No subscription stopped until all arrears are paid.

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1884.

## WOODHOUSE PRINTING.

To the Editor of the JARVIS RECORD.

SIR,—After a long delay the Reeve of Woodhouse gave his version of how the township printing was let in the last *Maple Leaf*. He says—

1st. "Were tenders asked for our Township printing?" Yes. The clerk was instructed to ask the *Canadian Reformer*, and *Maple Leaf*. The *Jarvis Record* put in a tender at the first meeting of the Council. Porritt says that he is not aware of anyone being asked except the *Maple Leaf*. If he had made the necessary enquiry he would have found that the clerk did as he was instructed.

Well I have made the necessary enquiry and on consulting the clerk's book containing the minutes of the council I find the following resolution, passed at the January meeting of the council:—"Moved by Mr. Trinder, and seconded by Mr. Woolley, that tenders for the township printing be received up till our next meeting on the second of February by the clerk." There is nothing said about the *Reformer*, *Canadian*, or *Maple Leaf*. Again, Stickney says:—

2nd. "Were those tenders to be opened at a fixed time?" Tenders were to be received until the council met."

He don't answer this question at all, but another that is not asked. The question is when were the tenders to be opened—not when received. Stickney says:—

3rd. "Did our deputy Reeve open said tenders at the first meeting of the council, and find two both being the same amount, and then adjourn for dinner?" Porritt says there were no tenders at first meeting of the council. He is mistaken. The *Jarvis Record* had a tender handed in by McLean. He says it was only a communication. It reads thus:—"Tender for printing. He says during the forenoon of the second meeting Mr. Morgan came in and laid his tender before me. This is not correct. I was not there when the council opened. Porritt took the chair, and the tenders were open before I got there, and a resolution drawn up by Mr. Woolley, and he asked Mr. Trinder to second it but he did not, and the matter rested until I came. Porritt says he moved and Woolley seconded to give the printing to the *Record*. I did not see such a resolution. He says, after dinner McLean handed in his tender. The clerk did not ask him to tender. It was printers that he was instructed to ask."

I said when Pettit applied for the printing again this year as he did in previous years, he did not know it was to be let by tender, since no tenders have been asked for during the last three years. Hence his offer to do the printing on the same terms as before without knowing that others were to be asked to tender for it was not a competitive tender at all. Stickney did not see my motion to give the *Record* the printing it was because he did not want to see it. I placed such a motion before him, but instead of taking a vote on it he suggested that we go to dinner. He says it was printers, the clerk was instructed to ask. I have quoted the resolution giving the clerk his instructions from which you see that Stickney asserts what is not correct. The resolution don't mention printers, or any one else. Again, he says:—

4th. "Did the same Deputy Reeve inform Dr. McLean of this fact?" I do not know who informed McLean, but he became aware of the tenders and their amounts."

How does Stickney know that McLean became aware. Simply making the assertion does not prove it, or make it so. I would ask did not Morgan become aware of the *Record's* tender before putting in his own? Stickney adds:—

5th. "Did that same Dr. McLean send in after the re-assembling of the council, another tender one dollar less than the others?" McLean handed a tender after re-assembling, to Mr. Porritt, and he moved to give it to McLean. I voted against it, and gave it to the *Maple Leaf*. The *Jarvis Record* and *Maple Leaf* were the only bona fide tenders, and both the same amount.

I voted to accept the lowest tender. This is the rule observed by the council when letting all other township jobs and I saw no reason why we should depart from it when letting the printing. Had the spirit of our resolution "to receive tenders till our next meeting" been enforced, Mr. Pettit was entitled to the contract, since his was the only application received by the clerk when the council met. If Morgan had a right to put in a tender after we met so had McLean and one tender was, therefore, as bona fide as the other. I don't think it was any more unfair for McLean to know Morgan's figures than it was for the latter to know what the *Record's* terms were. Stickney concludes:—

"I hope when Mr. Porritt will state the facts, and no side."

Well, I have endeavored to state the facts without making any false statements like Stickney did as I proved our own minutes recorded in the clerk's book.

Yours truly,

Wm. PORRITT.

Woodhouse, June 10th.

## Machine Man vs. Gilhooly.

To the Editor of the JARVIS RECORD:

SIR,—In the last issue of your paper I notice, along with other of Gilhooly's effusions, a statement concerning the machine man, who, I believe, he is trying his best to slander, if possible, as well as damage his business reputation. When all other means had apparently failed he resorts to false assertions, such as the publishing of a letter which he claims a party (not a gentleman) handed to him. By oversight, no doubt, Gilhooly forgot to favor you, Mr. Editor, with the name of the recipient of this letter, who was none other than Sam Patch. Now, I am informed when Sam handed this letter to Gilhooly he accompanied it with an offer of a few bumpers of bug-juice, providing it was published, and all knowing Gil's weakness in that respect he doubtless received his recompense, as the boys say Sam's shoes appeared to fit him rather close at the time. I claim the assertions false on these grounds, namely: The bare faced appearance of Gilhooly's statement. The machine man also informs me that the contract was not completed for house rent, as there was to have been writings, which was apparently an impossibility. Our worthy citizens all objected strongly, and advised the machine man to have nothing to do with the said Samuel. Our Selkirk friends would be bitterly down on him if he allowed this man in their midst again. Sam has lived in the village before, and I am informed the citizens all did their best to have him routed, never wishing him back again. So your readers will learn it was no great credit to Gilhooly to have such trash published. Gil admits receiving the *Hageraville Times* addressed to J. W. Reid, so in future I think it advisable for him to sign his proper name when writing up matters of a personal nature. All, or nearly all, of the readers of the *RECORD* are acquainted with Gilhooly, by reputation, if not by name. As Bobby Burns he at one time framed conspicuous, until others more mighty grappled him in their talons. Then he resorted to his cowardly nature and took upon himself the name of another. Trusting, Mr. Editor, you will kindly give me space for this letter, I am, yours truly,

THE MACHINE MAN'S FRIEND.

## PORT DOVER DOINGS.

POST OFFICE.—Our post office was never kept so efficiently as now. It is just like a new broom. Public officials require to be stirred up occasionally to let them know they are the servants of the people, and that their office is something besides a mere sinecure.

WELL DIGGER.—Mr. Alcock says he cleaned out a well for His Worship and was to receive three dollars to shove down his own trousers and pay for an assistant besides. He furthermore adds that he received the wherewith for himself, but is out the wages of his pal.

ANOTHER JUSTICE.—The sub "beak" the other day brought a load of drift wood into port behind his craft for which the harbor master demanded toll. His Honor declined to pay up and after a few slight recriminations on both sides his Worship sought the justice shop for relief. This worthy served him as he did the vinegar man's wife and sent him away comfortless.

DOMINION DAY.—About a hundred dollars have already been collected which will likely be doubled and a big time is expected here on the first of July.

ARMY.—The Gospel Army only got as far as Black Creek last Sabbath. They will open fire on the enemy's camp here next Sunday.

TWO DOLLARS.—I am told that all our city Fathers went up to the county council at its last meeting about the swing bridge and afterwards voted themselves the small matter of two dollars each, besides cab hire, for about half a day's work, though, perhaps, none of them unless McBride would have been earning a shilling at home. This beats John Stickney, for he only demands a dollar fifty a day for his valuable services. Couldn't one member have been delegated to deliver a message to the county council without