hon. friend has moved for the papers and when they come down I will have an opportunity of seeing them and will ascertain from the Postmaster General his reasons for this change. I cannot speak at this moment on that subject, because I am not conversant with it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman is made conversant with the Order in Council, and the recommendation and other facts connected with the reason why the course was adopted. I presume he could, with the same industry and desire, obtain the other.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I just looked at the figures which were here before me in the paper. I have never considered the subject.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Might I ask what newspaper that was?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I will send it over to my hon. friend. It is the *Daily Ontario*.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is a recapitulation of the Postmaster General's letter. I have no desire to continue this discussion further than to point out this fact, that the cities to which the hon. Minister of Justice referred, and from which he drew his comparisons, were never placed under the Civil Service Act, and consequently they were not analogous in the positions that they held; he did not refer either to the cost of the city of Belleville post office compared with the cost of other cities to which I referred exclusively. I pointed out in my remarks all that the hon. gentleman has said, that the towns cost less than the cities. Whatever responsibility and wrong was done when placing Belleville or any other city under the Civil Service Act, is one for which the late government must be held responsible. I do not deny anything of that kind. But the hon. gentleman was exceedingly unfair in the manner in which he put the case. I stated positively and distinctly that I did not object or find fault with the policy which had been adopted by the Postmaster General, in reducing a city office to a town office, but I did complain that that policy has been confined to one city alone, while other cities represented by Liberals were not touched, and the hon. gentleman said that other cities were represented by Conservatives. What cities are they excedt Fredericton and Sherbrooke? St. Thomas was not a city office. Brantford and Galt were not city offices.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—But they are cities.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I do not say they are not cities. There are towns where the revenues are larger than in some of the cities. I admit that, but that is not the point. The hon. gentleman confined his criticism exclusively to those offices which were under the system of percentage instead of taking the cities which I compared, and which I complained were not reduced. If the hon. gentleman would reduce the other cities and degrade them like Belleville, and place them as towns, I would not find fault. I stated that distinctly and plainly, and I say that the hon. gentleman was extremely unfair when he said I was speaking in defence of the old system, when I studiously explained to the House that I was not, and that I would approve of any system that might be adopted that would reduce the expenditure. I can come to only the one conclusion, and that is that he selected Belleville because it was a Conservative city; and if he did not, why did he not take the others? These facts were before him. He knew just as well that the other small cities under the Civil Service Act were more expensive than Belleville, and why did he not apply the same rule to them? It is unfair for the hon. gentleman to attribute to me sentiments which I did not entertain, when, on the contrary, I distinctly approved of the Postmaster General's policy, and only blamed him for having failed to apply it generally.

The motion was agreed to.

DUTY ON TIMBER AND SHINGLES.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.) rose to inquire:

Has the attention of the government been directed to a memorial of the Board of Trade of Vancouver, British Columbia, with reference to the importation of sawn timber and shingles free of duty, and is it the intention to impose a duty this year on timber and shingles?

He said: The last part of the question may be one of the sequels attached to the annual budget. but seeing it is an article of commodity free of duty, and not anything