

try, there was a necessity for reducing the duty upon coal oil from 15 cents, and this was accordingly done, being reduced to six cents. And, Sir, the duty which has since been collected of six cents per gallon has been as great or greater a percentage on the market value of the oil than the duty of 15 cents was in 1877. I beg to submit the following figures for consideration. In 1877 there was imported under a tariff of 15 cents per gallon 348,635 gallons of oil, valued at \$105,888, upon which was collected \$57,328.44 or 54.3 per cent ad valorem. In 1896, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the quantity of oil imported was 6,682,272 gallons, valued at \$596,450, upon which was paid six cents per gallon, or a total of \$412,996, which was 69.33 per cent ad valorem. Again, taking the export price of oil as given in the United States abstract of 1896, I find it to be 6.8 cents per wine gallon. Reducing this to Imperial, we find that the price for Imperial gallon is 8.16 cents. A duty of six cents upon this would be 73½ per cent ad valorem as against 54.3 per cent when the duty was 15 cents. I will now undertake to show hon. members of this House what duty on coal oil has cost the consumers since coal oil was discovered in Canada. We find that there has been consumed in Canada from 1877 to 1885, both years included 232,756,786 gallons of refined petroleum. Of this amount 155,489,641 gallons was produced in Canada, and 77,267,145 gallons imported from the United States. The Canadian Government have received upon the imported, reckoning a uniform rate of six cents per gallon, since 1877, \$4,636,028. And the oil cost the consumers in Canada during that time \$13,965,407.16 more than it would had there been no duty upon it, and that amount more than the same quantity cost the consumers in the United States. And, tracing it back to the time when oil was first produced in Canada it has undoubtedly cost the consumers to keep this industry in existence no less than \$22,000,000—an amount equal to what the oil men claim has been invested in this important industry. It is claimed by the classes to whom I have referred that there is no good reason why coal oil should receive more protection than other necessaries of life of equal importance. Light is a very important household necessity; light is the poor man's friend; it cheers his heart when his daily toil is over to reach his well-lighted home where he can rest in the bosom of his family, and read during the long winter evenings. That is the only time he has to devote to study to reading and to learning. Therefore, it greatly contributes to the intelligence, the welfare and happiness of that class of our people. Now, it is claimed on behalf of this portion of our population that the Government should endeavour to give them a good and a cheap light, which they are not receiv-

Mr. MOORE.

ing at the present time. They also draw our attention to the fact that the people in towns and cities and populous centres have, to a great extent, discarded the coal oil lamp, and are now using gas and electricity; so that most of the coal oil now used and likely to be used in the future, will be used by farmers, labouring men and the poorer classes of this country, upon whom the burden of taxation will fall most heavily. This, Sir, is all I have to say in regard to the claim of the consumer upon this Government in respect of the reduction of the duty. In the second place, I will consider for a few moments the claims of the producers and the refiners. Their business is considered an important one, and I believe, Sir, that they have had an unreasonable and unnecessary protection. But the protection which has been accorded in the past has stimulated capitalists to invest their means to a large extent in the business. It has been in existence something over thirty years; and it is claimed that the withdrawal of any portion of the tariff would destroy their industry altogether, that is giving employment to a large number of workingmen, and if wiped out of existence, it would shut up many other works which depend upon the production of crude oil, such as barrel manufactures, the manufacture of gasoline, benzine, naphtha lubricating oil, paraffine wax, paraffine candles, chewing gum, colouring materials and other very useful articles in connection with this industry. But this motion which I present to the House has nothing whatever to do with the production of crude oil or any of its products, but only with that used for illuminating purposes. Therefore, it would not be considered just nor in the interests of the country to take away all protection of an industry which has grown up under the fostering care of both Governments. I may be excused for saying here that in 1876 the coal oil men claimed that any reduction in the duty from 15 cents per gallon would wipe the industry out of existence. In 1877 the duty was reduced from 15 to 6 cents per gallon, since which time the production has steadily increased from 12,813,566 gallons in 1881, to 26,760,247 gallons in 1895. As these gentlemen were false prophets in 1876 and 1877, we may fondly hope that they may be mistaken in 1897, should the Government take into consideration and reduce the duty upon this article in the terms which I have proposed in my motion. In the third place, the pressing demand upon the treasury to pay current expenditures, to say nothing of the extraordinary requests for assistance to build public works of various kinds, may not admit of a great and material reduction in the aggregate of the duties which are imposed upon imported articles, but they may be so adjusted as to bear more lightly upon the poorer classes. So far as this article is concerned, I have no doubt that the patriotic tillers of the soil will loyally yield to any