

And whilst my hon. friend is about that investigation, I ask him to take up another—no other than the case of my redoubtable and long-known friend, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), whose special mission for eighteen years was to thunder up and down this wide country of ours declaiming against pilfering, pillaging, stealing and corruption; and yet, Sir, I am not beyond the mark in declaring, I think, that hundreds of thousands of a pamphlet which purports to be a speech uttered by this hon. gentleman, outside of the session of parliament entirely—at Massey Hall—a purely extraordinary campaign speech by a member of a party and for the purposes of a party—in sealed envelopes, and government envelopes at that, were sent out to the people of this country, and that every one of those pamphlets has taken four cents out of the treasury of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). Well, Sir, I would convey to my hon. friend my most earnest suggestion that a little more careful oversight on his part with reference to his co-members of the cabinet would lessen that deficit which he deplures, and would be a great step forward towards an equilibrium of expenses and income in the department over which he presides. But, Sir, I merely state this by the way. The important point was to establish the paternity of this brochure. It is established. It comes under the sign-manual of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I do not intend to read it; I will read only a little of what it says. It gives the exports of certain agricultural products in 1895-6—\$35,000,000 in round numbers. It goes on to give the value of the same in 1897-8—\$65,000,000. Thus there is an increase between these two periods of \$30,000,000. What is the statement in the appeal?

Is it because the policy of the Laurier government has thus put \$30,000,000 more into the farmers' pockets that the electors should turn that government out at the elections?

I commend that as an example to the framers of the next address to be brought down to this House, if hon. gentlemen opposite should have the extreme felicity of preparing that address. I should say to them, 'Gentlemen, do not live so far beneath your privileges; when you put an item into the speech from the Throne, in which you talk of the great increase of exports, apply this brilliant idea of the Minister of Agriculture, who is paramount in that respect at least, for that is his own department, and say that all of this \$30,000,000, \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 is actually money that has been put into the pockets of the farmers through and by the policy of the present administration.'

I am also bound to say that the framer of this address in that passage did not fairly cover the measure of what might

have been done, taking the same Minister of Agriculture as authority. For this precious pamphlet, in three-fourths of its pages, is nothing more nor less than a fulsome and exaggerated compliment to the Minister of Agriculture for the immense benefits that he has conferred upon the country. All the credit for the increase in the exports of agricultural products, for cold storage, for all the extended plans and the like of that, is modestly claimed in this brochure for the Minister of Agriculture. Where was this hon. gentleman when this passage in the address was being indited? He should have been close by, for he has defrauded himself in this most flagrant way of what he certainly claims to be an appanage of himself and himself alone as Minister of Agriculture in this government.

The next reference is to the Post Office:

I am glad to observe that the returns from the Post Office Department afford good ground for believing that the temporary loss of revenue caused by the great reduction recently made in letter postage will speedily be made good by the increased correspondence consequent thereon.

I notice that everywhere great credit is taken to the government for the reduction of postage. Is history silent with reference to the previous work of the Post Office Department in the reduction of postage? Was there not a time when it cost five cents to carry every letter to its destination? Was there not a reduction of the postage from five cents to three cents, and was not that reduction made by a Liberal-Conservative government? Was there not a time when five cents or three cents carried only a single half-ounce, and did there not come another time when the same amount of money covered double the weight? In reality, for all that kind of correspondence the postage was cut in two. Was that something to the credit of a previous administration, or was it not? There was a time when every newspaper in this country bore postage. There was another time, and for a long period, during which no newspaper in this country carried any postage, and when the people's magazines went free from one end of this country to the other. That also was due to a Liberal-Conservative administration. And if these hon. gentlemen have undertaken to reduce the postage, somewhat further, that is in line of the progress which has been made already. I am not going to repeat my criticism in regard to that. But I have one criticism to make upon my hon. friend, who has, I believe, in 1899, a deficit of a little less than \$400,000. He congratulates the country upon the deficit being no more than that; but in the Public Accounts, if I am not mistaken, there is debited to the Post Office service \$21,000—for what? For the Yukon mail service of the year 1898-9; and what is more, only \$5,000 of that is