

As soon as the total number of stamps mentioned in said schedule is issued the plates from which they will have been engraved will be destroyed in the presence of the head and two officers of the department. On the 10th June, the Post Office Department will proceed to supply jubilee postage stamps to the principal post offices in Canada, and through them the minor post offices will obtain their supply until the issue is exhausted. If this jubilee issue were to wholly displace the ordinary postage stamps it would supply the ordinary wants of the country for between two and three months, but as the use of the ordinary postage stamp will proceed concurrently with that of the jubilee stamps it is expected that the jubilee stamp will last beyond the three months. Inasmuch as the department is already receiving applications for the purchase of jubilee stamps, it may be stated that the department will adhere to the established practice of supplying them only to postmasters and through them to the public, who may purchase them on and after the 19th June, 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend state where these stamps are being printed, if they are now being printed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not at present being printed. They will be printed in the city of Ottawa.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. In the "Daily Witness" of May 15, appears a letter from the correspondent at Ottawa, in which the correspondent writes as follows:—

Mr. Davin, prefacing his doctrine with the declaration that he was an authority on journalism, laid it down as a cardinal principle of newspaper management, that every communication sent to the paper must be published, a remark which showed Mr. Davin to be as ignorant of journalism as he is of parliamentary propriety.

I never made the declaration, and the statement of the correspondent that I did so has no foundation in fact. It would be an absurd statement from a person who knew nothing of journalism and from a person

Mr. MULOCK.

who knows something of journalism, it would be still more absurd. What I did say—I quote now from the unrevised "Hansard"—was this:—

Mr. Fairlie asked to have his letter published, and newspaper men know that it is the practice to publish a reply.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was also sent to the "Free Press."

Mr. DAVIN. I have had as long an experience of journalism as either my hon. friend or the editor of the "Free Press." I know what is the duty of a journalist: it is that if a man accused by a newspaper sends a reply it is the duty of a journalist to publish it. The Finance Minister is a journalist, and he knows what the practice is. Especially is this the case when the newspaper has criticised it. To criticise a letter he receives, and then put it into the waste paper basket or into a pigeon-hole is equivalent to slapping the man's face and then boxing his ears.

There is therefore not a tittle of foundation in the statement in the letter of the correspondent. Again, the same correspondent, in the last issue of the "Witness" to hand, that of May 19, referring to one of the debates here, says:—

Mr. Davin announced that he had not risen to discuss the tariff matter, but now he would do so.

Mr. Davin had three newspaper files on his desk, one in French and two Winnipeg newspapers, all bearing on the tariff and on a discussion which proceeded some time ago on a tariff motion of his own; so that, while professing no intention to speak on the subject, the evidence all pointed to the contrary.

My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is not here, but there are gentlemen around me who were here at the time, who know, and it is not necessary to have their evidence at all, because my word is sufficient, what occurred. While speaking, I bent down to my friend the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and asked him to send a page into the reading-room for the papers from which I wished to quote. Here are two letters, in an interval of two or three days, making two complete misstatements as to a matter of fact regarding the conduct of an hon. member of this House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to raise a