

So the point that is said to be essential is provided for in this resolution, that is that the existing rate shall continue until that provision is approved of by Parliament. In other words the question remains open for consideration and both parties have a right to present their case in reference to it. This was in effect the position taken by the press throughout the country and the position I am sorry the Government have not acceded to. We should have a definite decision on the point, and I therefore press my amendment. The result of course is this: that while the House of Commons agreed to our amendment except with reference to a determination of a maximum of one cent as a fixed rate, we leave the matter open with reference to that so that the whole question can be dealt with at once, and it is important that it should be so dealt with and that its hands shall not be tied with figures. There is no necessity to commit Parliament by a new law going into force which at the beginning of next session will have to be changed again. Under these circumstances the rate will continue as at present.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR—What is the present rate?

Hon. Mr. KERR—My recollection is it is a varying rate. It is the principle I am discussing now; it is that Parliament is not tied and can deal with the matter as it thinks proper, while under the supposed measure as sent to us from the House of Commons, Parliament would be tied.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—That has been the point of the whole controversy namely that the Postmaster General should not have authority to fix those rates until the next session of Parliament. Now, my hon. friend reaffirms that. For that principle the opponents of the Bill have been contending since its introduction into this House. That is now being reaffirmed in the motion which my hon. friend has moved. The Government has made some very material concessions to the opponents of the Bill. To accept this amendment would be equivalent to the opponents of the Bill saying we have secured everything we demanded, and that no consideration should be given to the views of the Government as to the authority which should be exercised by the Postmaster General. In the message which has come down from the House of Commons to the Senate the Government feels it has conceded all it can concede on this question.

Hon. Mr. KERR.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—If the newspaper men are right it would be no crime if they got all they demanded.

Hon. Mr. KERR—I wish to reply to the hon. leader of the Government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—We are not conducting this discussion as if we were in committee. If this goes on we will not get through before to-morrow morning.

Hon. Mr. KERR—I suppose I can say something in reply to the leader of the Government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman introduced his amendment and spoke to it and deprived himself of the right to reply.

Hon. Mr. KERR—Does the hon. gentleman contend that I have no right to reply?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No, his amendment is not a substantive measure.

Hon. Mr. KERR—The Government wish to stifle discussion.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No, the Government do not wish to do anything of the kind. I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The SPEAKER—The question is on the amendment moved by the hon. member from Toronto. The hon. gentleman made his speech and wound it up by submitting his amendment, which is before the House.

Hon. Mr. KERR—Since then the Government has answered.

The SPEAKER—The Government has answered and the hon. gentleman has a right to have some one else reply in his name, but he has no right to make another speech. A member proposing an amendment has no right to reply.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—In the interests of the press itself my hon. friend is making a great mistake when he insists upon his amendment, particularly after the concession which the Government has made in the Bill in fixing the maximum rate at which postage can be imposed. On one point I feel just as strong as my hon. friend, but I shall not discuss it now. Looking at the Bill as it is before us to-day I find that the provisions for the protection of the press are quite ample. Should any injustice be done to them it can only last