

I having some knowledge of the question about which he speaks, that the facts have evidently been furnished by some person outside, by some person not at all acquainted with the industry. It is somewhat surprising to me that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, who was elected to this House as a supporter of a high protective system, coal oil being among other articles protected by the tariff, should be found seeking to break down the tariff that his friends during eighteen long years have stood by and supported. The conclusion to be drawn from that is only one, and it is that the hon. gentleman living on the boundary down in the province of Quebec, an imaginary line dividing his county from the United States, is a protectionist in the day time, and a free trader at night.

Mr. MOORE. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. I never smuggled a gallon of oil in my life.

Mr. LISTER. Then the hon. gentleman has been deprived of light; he does not come within the category so pathetically described by him, that light is the poor man's friend; he does not belong to that class. I said a moment ago that this is not the proper time to discuss this question. The Government have to-day announced that the tariff would be brought down a week from to-morrow. When it comes down we will know what the Government propose to do, whether they will meet the views of the hon. gentleman or not. If they meet his views, then this motion is entirely unnecessary. If the explanations that may then be made are sufficient to satisfy him that the industry will be completely wiped out by a reduction of the duty to 3 cents per gallon, the hon. gentleman, who is a protectionist, who has announced himself to be desirous of promoting any natural industry, will no doubt be found supporting the Government even in case the duty should not be reduced to the extent that he to-night wishes it to be reduced. The hon. gentleman's figures, and they are many and complex, are not strictly accurate, and I may say to him moreover that although the present tax appears to be a considerable tax, it is not the burdensome tax the hon. gentleman imagines it to be. There are about 15,000,000 gallons of refined oil consumed, which would give for each family about 15 gallons. Statistics show that cities, towns and villages burn much more proportionately than the country portions of Canada, and the result is this that less than 15 gallons per family is consumed in the country districts. Taking the duty at 6 cents per gallon and the consumption at 12 gallons per family, the total tax, this over burdensome tax, would only reach 72 cents per year. However, that is a matter for discussion, and no doubt it will be brought before the House when the tariff

Mr. LISTER.

comes down and be discussed by competent men. In the meantime I do not see any particular necessity at this particular moment, and in view of the early date at which the tariff is to be brought down, why we should further discuss this question. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. QUINN moved for :

Copy of letter addressed by Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick to Hon. Edward Blake asking for his opinion as to the settlement of the Manitoba school question under the judgment of the Privy Council.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no such record in the archives of the department, I may inform my hon. friend.

Motion negatived.

POSTMASTER AT BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. BERGERON moved for :

Copies of all papers, correspondence, petitions, &c., connected with the dismissal of Alexis Doutré as postmaster at Beauharnois.

He said: The hon. the Postmaster General stated the other day, in reply to a question of mine, that the postmaster at Beauharnois had been dismissed at the demand of the Minister of Public Works, and that the complaint was that the postmaster kept a political committee in his office. My object in making the motion is to have all the papers in regard to the dismissal of Mr. Doutré. I wish to tell the Postmaster General, that as I understand it, when the postmaster was dismissed he asked for what reason he had been so dismissed. On being informed that it was for active and offensive partisanship, he asked for an investigation, as he believed he was in a position to refute the charge. The investigation was refused, and he then asked to know who the complainant against him was, but he was answered that he would not be told. We were told the other day, however, that the complainant was the Minister of Public Works. When the correspondence comes down, I believe that it will show, that there should have been an investigation, and that if the Postmaster General had acted justly towards Mr. Doutré he would have allowed an inquiry. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) will bring down all the papers as soon as possible, and it will be my duty then to call the attention of the House to the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Speaker, there is no objection whatever to the order passing. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) no doubt made his statement on the information he had received, but I think he will find when the