

be resisted as we would resist any such condition as I have referred to in connection with the Alaskan boundary. Until we know those facts and what the points of difference are, we cannot, of course, discuss the question intelligently. I am only calling attention to that which has appeared in the public press as one of the concessions which Canada offers to make to the United States in connection with that great question. We all know the value of the fisheries, the wealth they have brought to Newfoundland and to Canada, and we also know the importance of maintaining inviolate the rights that we possess under all circumstances. I give expression to these, my own views, I believe them to be the views of the Canadian people generally, and I shall be glad to get information from the Minister of Justice—that is if he feels at liberty to furnish it, knowing the delicacy which surrounds him in speaking on questions of this kind, unsettled as they are, in any speech which he may make in this Senate and which will receive publicity. I understand that thoroughly, and consequently do not look for that answer which I should like to receive upon this important question, and upon other questions upon which they say a settlement has been reached. However, if concessions of that kind have been made; if the rumours which have appeared in the public press are to be taken as correct upon these points, I hope that if a treaty of that kind ever comes before us it will be rejected by the Parliament of Canada, as the United States rejected treaties into which they had entered with Great Britain in the past, and treated with ignominy—I will not say with contempt. I am not so much enamoured as my hon. friend is with what he calls the concession and great advantages of the penny postage. I know that it is popular—and perhaps it would be impolitic for me to express an opinion upon it—particularly with the commercial community. It is popular with those who do a great deal of correspondence. I know in my own small business that the tax upon newspapers is about compensated by the saving in postage, but it is only an adjustment of taxation and no more. If you relieve the commercial community, as this does, by one cent on every letter, the deficiency has to be made up by somebody else, and the deficiency will have to be taken out of the pockets of those who do not have any correspondence,

and consequently that portion of the community for whom in the past you have been so very solicitous—the agriculturists who we have been told, were not only degraded but ground down to the very lowest depths, will have to assist in making up that deficit if the theories which hon. gentlemen opposite have preached for years be correct, that they, through the National Policy, have been taxed and are taxed at the present time. You say, pertinent to this, that you have carried out your promise of free trade. There is only about one and a half per cent difference between the present tariff and the old tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite denounced. In some articles protection is higher than under the old tariff, even with the 25 per cent preference to the English manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen opposite began, like a fakir who wants to sell his goods: he marks his price high and then states in his window that he gives 25 per cent reduction for cash. You took some articles which bore a 25 per cent duty in the old tariff, and raised the rate to 35 per cent, and then said, “we will give a 25 per cent preference to Great Britain.” Now subtract the 25 per cent from 35 per cent, and you have a protection left of 26½ per cent left, being one and a quarter per cent better for our manufacturers than the old National Policy tariff which hon. gentlemen have condemned for the last eighteen years; and my hon. friend (Mr. Kerr) rejoices at the fact that the manufacturers are reveling in delight at the idea that they have not been yet run out of existence. I cordially approve of the protection they enjoy. Every one knows that I am, and have been a protectionist, and the older I grow the stronger I am in my convictions on that point. If my hon. friend will go on and re-impose the duties on the industries which he has destroyed, he shall have my hearty support. I admit, in connection with this, that the unification, if I may use that term, of the postage throughout the whole world is an idea at which we should all rejoice, but in adopting it in Canada with our sparse population as compared with other nations, we are just removing the tax from one particular subject and putting it on another; for the \$700,000 deficit this year arising from a deficiency in postage—provided the statements I have read are correct—must be paid by some one. I notice in the Ad-