

Justice at any time since 1891? If so, for what period and at what salary? Is he still employed in that department? If not, why not? Is he at present in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity and at what salary? Is this Mr. Clark the same Mr. Clark who, it is alleged, surreptitiously took Mr. Farrer's pamphlet from the office of Hunter, Rose & Co., Toronto, during the last general election? Was this pamphlet given to the Government directly or indirectly by Mr. Clark?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Clark was employed in the Department of Justice after 1891, and also for a portion of 1891. His employment in the Department of Justice terminated on the 31st of October, 1892. He had been in receipt of \$2 per day. He is not at present in the employment of the department; his services were no longer required. He is for the present employed as a temporary clerk in the Department of Agriculture, I think, in work connected with the Columbian Exhibition. This is the person who, in order to defeat a conspiracy to injure the commercial and fishery interests of this country with the object of coercing Canada into annexation, gave to a police officer a copy of a pamphlet, supposed to be the production of Mr. Farrer, in the annexation interest.

#### LETTER POSTAL RATE.

Mr. RIDER asked. Are the Government aware that in consequence of the lower rate of postage prevailing in the United States, particularly on ordinary letters, large numbers of Canadian letters destined to Canadian and other points are mailed in United States post offices along the border, thereby causing a considerable loss to the postal revenue of Canada? If so, what remedy does the Government propose to apply? Have the Government any intention of reducing the present rate of postage on ordinary letters?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government is aware that a number of letters are mailed at United States post offices where such post offices are in close proximity to Canadian towns or villages, as in the cases of St. Stephen and Calais, Derby Line and Stanstead, Windsor and Detroit. The postal convention between the United States and Canada provides that where mail matter is posted in either country in order to evade payment of the rate of postage payable in the other country, then the country to which such correspondence is mailed may charge an additional rate, and this regulation has been acted upon in cases where it has been deemed expedient to enforce it. The Government has no intention of reducing the rate of postage upon letters. The loss of revenue would be about \$700,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

#### THE CUSTOMS TARIFF.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That it is the opinion of this House that the duty on barbed wire, on agricultural implements, on coal oil and on cottons should be reduced so as to give no more than reasonable protection, and that the duty on binder twine should be abolished.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), when introducing his motion in regard to corn, remarked that it was not a motion of want of confidence in the Government. Well, Sir, I need hardly tell you that this is not a motion of want of confidence in the Government; and there is no reason whatever why a motion placed on the Paper as we place our motions should 'prima facie' be so considered. It is the constitutional way of bringing before the House the views of a member of Parliament in regard to any subject that he wishes to press upon the attention of the Government. If a motion assails the policy of the Government, if it directly asserts no confidence in the Government, it is of course a want of confidence motion; or if a member, on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, moves an amendment thereto of any kind, which the Government resists, and his amendment is carried, it may properly be considered a vote of want of confidence, because it is in direct opposition to that of the Government; but even that is a matter of opinion with the Government. I crave the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments while I press upon them certain views with regard to the tariff and especially with regard to that portion of the tariff to which my motion refers; and were my ability to place before the House the views I wish to express, equal to the importance of these views, I should have no fear about commanding the attention of the House. I wish first to refer to a remark which appeared in the newspapers, echoing a remark I heard here, to the effect that it was very strange that I should express views in opposition to those of the Government on the tariff, and yet that I should not vote with the Opposition. The reason is this, that I am a supporter of the Government, that I am a believer in the National Policy, and that it is from that stand-point I press upon the Government and this House the necessity of dealing with the subjects mentioned in my motion, in the way I suggest. There are, speaking broadly, three kinds of tariff. You can have a purely revenue tariff, or a moderately protective tariff, or a tariff that would be exclusive; and unless you have direct taxation, the latter would be a 'reductio ad absurdum,' because it would give you no revenue. But it is obvious that between a minimum protective tariff and a tariff excluding all foreign imports, there are many points where you could have tariffs, some of which would be moderate and some of which would be outrageously protective and oppressive. Of course, if you had a