

literature as to give up their subscriptions to newspapers unless they were carried free. This question was one simply of demand and supply. Those who required newspapers would subscribe for them, and they would make no more objection to paying the Government for carrying their papers than they would to paying the editor or publisher the subscription price. He could therefore see no ground for the demand that newspaper postage should be entirely abolished. It was not a tax. It bore no resemblance to a tax. It was not something imposed upon parties for the purpose of enabling the Government to do something else, but it was simply a charge, and a very small charge indeed, considering the amount of labor involved in carrying newspapers from the place of publication to the parties wishing to receive them. Another observation he would make was this: He believed that if they did away with newspaper postage altogether the result would be to close up a considerable number of small post offices throughout the country. He himself had experienced very considerable difficulty in getting post offices established where he thought they were necessary, and he was quite sure if the postage on newspapers was abolished, and that source of legitimate revenue taken away from the Postmaster General, he would find very great difficulty in extending facilities for the distribution of postal matter to the people of sparsely populated rural districts. He apprehended that people who would have to go four or five miles instead of one or two for the purpose of receiving postal matter, would be much more likely to discontinue their subscriptions to newspapers than they would on account of having to pay 20 or 25 cents postage. He was, therefore, entirely opposed to the principle of the abolition of postage on newspapers, and held that there were no grounds upon which it could be justified. The money required for carrying on the Post Office Department must be had somewhere. It must come out of the pockets of the people in some form or other, and he could see no fairer way of getting the money than by requiring people who received newspapers and letters to pay the small charge imposed for carrying them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not rise to continue the debate, but to

Mr. Colby.

ask the hon. gentleman to postpone it. The House had now heard the explanations of the Postmaster General, and the hon. gentleman would see from the remarks of various members that his Bill would be treated on its merits, and not in any way as a party measure. He would also suggest that in the meantime the hon. gentleman consider well the point taken by the members for South Oxford and Cardwell respecting the advantage of consolidating the postal law rather than passing a Bill in amendment. If there were two large Acts in force Postmasters and others would have great difficulty in ascertaining exactly what was the law, and it would be a great advantage to the public to have all the law on the subject embodied in one Act. He would also suggest to the Postmaster General that he introduce his resolutions relating to the rates and prepayment of postage without delay, as it was irregular to discuss these matters in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD said, as there appeared to be a general desire to have the debate adjourned, he would not raise any objection, though, as the objections were principally to details, he had supposed they might better be considered in Committee.

On motion the debate was adjourned.

PRESERVATION OF PEACE IN VICINITY OF PUBLIC WORKS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE, the Bill to amend the Acts for the better preservation of peace in the vicinity of public works was read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole forthwith, and reported with amendments.

PROTECTION ON RAILWAYS.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE moved the second reading of an Act for the better protection of persons and property conveyed by railways. He said the bill would be referred to the Committee on Railways and Telegraph Lines.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD said he was glad to hear it. The measure was one requiring to be well considered by the Minister of Justice before it became law.

The bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee on Railway and Telegraph lines.