

paid to those clerks should be at least \$600 a year; it is only \$500 at present. Then we find the fourth clause repealing another clause. I am not at this moment ready to explain what this is. Then the Bill provides for temporary employment, also permanent employment. Then it provides for what is equally important in the administration of any department, the qualification of those who have the transaction and management of the business to which they are appointed; it provides for an age limit, which is not provided for at present; it repeals certain clauses; it deals with letter-carriers, and the insurance of letters, and some other minor matters. These will all remain as they are now if this Bill is so amended as not to be accepted by the House of Commons. The gentleman who represents the Government here tells us that if this amendment be made, the Government will not accept it, and consequently the Bill will have to drop. I was very much amused at the declaration of my hon. friend the senator from Killarney (Hon. Mr. Young) when he stated that the amendment could in no wise be considered a want of confidence in the Government. There was a simplicity about that declaration that rather amused me, coming from a gentleman of the experience of that hon. senator. This amendment makes the provision, that no matter of what character the regulations may be, in reference to what constitutes a newspaper, or what the rate of postage may be, or to what extent the zone may covered, and the rates of postage imposed upon it, they cannot become law until they are referred to Parliament for its sanction. I do not think it is possible to devise any stronger language to express a want of confidence in the Postmaster General. But let us consider this: is there not sufficient protection to the newspaper business under the present law? First, all regulations must be approved by the Treasury Board and subsequently by the council, and after that they have to be sent to Parliament at the first session after which the regulations are drawn up, and Parliament has to be asked whether they approve or disapprove of them. To my mind they are going quite far enough, except in the one point to which I referred, and which I would like to see adopted—but you are not adopting it by the proposition now before the Senate. If you adopt this amendment depend upon it all the improvements and amendments to the Act provided for in this Bill will be lost until Parliament meets again. Then it will be reintroduced,

and a law will be passed containing all those improved amendments to the Post Office Act, in the meantime those affected must suffer.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—I have listened very carefully to what the hon. gentleman from Hastings (Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell) has said, and he certainly has not convinced me as to the advantage of allowing this clause to go through as it is. The amendment proposed to the clause is a very much more satisfactory and straightforward way of accomplishing the object. The proposition that rates are to be fixed by the Treasury Board, and then if not agreed to by Parliament, the newspaper men are to have their money returned to them later on, is rather complicated. That sort of arrangement always leads to a good deal of trouble and annoyance. The hon. gentleman then went on to talk about the Bill itself, and he and the leader of the Government held up to us the statement that if those clauses were not adopted in the way that it is brought down, that the whole Bill would be withdrawn. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are not going to alter their course on account of a statement of that kind, because we have had a similar statement once before this session. A clause of the Bill was withdrawn because we had amended it, and afterwards the Bill was brought up again, and another clause substituted for it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I said that the Bill would be dropped if the amendment were adopted?

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—I understood the hon. gentleman supported the position taken by the leader of the Government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—What I said was that the leader of the Government had made that statement.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—The amendment suggested is decidedly an improvement, and I think we ought to pass it.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried on the following division:

Contents 28, non-contents 13.

Contents.

The Honourable Messieurs

- | | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| Beith, | Jones (Sir Lyman), |
| Bostock, | Kerr, |
| Casgrain, | Lavergne, |
| Cloran, | MacKay (Alma), |
| Dandurand, | McHugh, |
| David, | Mitchell, |
| Derbyshire, | Power, |