

tariff which strikes me as objectionable, from a revenue point of view at any rate, is the admission free of duty of vast quantities of goods which are denominated raw materials. If the absolute necessities of life were admitted free, I could perhaps see the fairness of admitting raw materials free. That is the English practice, but it seems to me that while there are duties on the necessities of life, the manufacturers' raw material should pay a small duty too. Last year the amount of raw materials imported free was somewhere in the neighbourhood of forty millions of dollars. Remember, I am speaking simply for myself. It occurs to me that a small duty of, say, five per cent on that forty millions of dollars would bring in something in the neighbourhood of two millions of dollars to the revenue, and I do not know any way in which the government could better get a revenue than in that way. The manufacturers' products are amply protected, and I think that they might pay a small revenue duty on their raw materials as other people pay duty on the necessities of life.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—That is getting further away from free trade.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not think so; it is a revenue tariff and that is the way to get revenue. It is not treating manufacturers as favourites of parliament when every one else is not favoured, but putting all on the same footing. The small duty of five per cent could not hurt the manufacturers materially, and it would help the rest of the community very materially. I dare say the hon. gentleman from Shell River would be pleased if I should devote more attention to the tariff, but I regret to say, and I think the House will say that I have already devoted too much to it. I hope before long to see a further reduction of the duty on coal oil, but in saying so, I speak for myself alone. The fourth paragraph of the speech deals with the recent gold discoveries on the Yukon and its tributaries. The paragraph also refers to the contract entered into subject to our approval. This matter has been dealt with at very considerable length already in the course of this debate. I am not objecting to it. I think perhaps on the whole the government have reason to congratulate themselves on the fact that the opposition

have devoted so much time to this Yukon contract. Strictly speaking, it would be more regular to wait until the government measure, which is now before the other House of parliament, came to the Senate, before discussing it at such length, but the course which has been adopted has its advantages as well as its disadvantages. Looking at this contract, every one must say that there is great necessity for prompt action, for exceedingly prompt action. Every one does agree with respect to that point: there is no difference of opinion. Thousands of people are hastening to get into that country, and I presume that later on in the season, when the winter winds begin to blow in the Klondike region again, most of those thousands of people will be in a great hurry to get out again, and it is an absolute duty on the part of the government, having done their best to warn the people against going in, to try and furnish them with the means of getting out. Hon. gentlemen should consider what the effect of the Senate rejecting this measure would be. Suppose we throw out the measure which is now before the other House; we cannot stop those who are going to the Klondike from going in, there will be almost no means of getting those thousands out again or getting food in to them—and if there was great difficulty getting food in for those who were there when winter set in last fall, the consequence would be very much more serious at the close of the coming season. When we consider what the effect of our rejecting the measure would probably be and what the country would think of the result, we should be very careful and deliberate in making up our minds. I do not say more than that. I do not say that if on the whole the measure does not commend itself to the judgment of the House they should pass it, but we should be careful and deliberate before making up our minds to reject it. We should approach the question in the spirit indicated by the hon. gentleman from Monck (Mr. McCallum), who said he would like to see the contract and consider it and deal with it on its merits. Just what view the hon. gentleman from Monck may ultimately take I cannot say. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman was a good deal like his fellow countryman, who said he was open to conviction, but he would like to see the man who could convince him. It is of vital necessity that an improved method