Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Well, I beg your pardon then, but if you have not done so on this occasion, it is the first

Mr. BLAKE. I have repeatedly spoken in another sense.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). That is how I noticed the matter. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) says he has received letters from the Judges complaining that their salaries were not high enough; but let there be a vacant Judgeship or deputy Judgeship and many letters come asking for the appointment. I think that both the Bar and the Bench are very well looked after, and the Government has acted wisely in dropping a portion of the resolutions. Had they not done so they would have found a good many of their supporters opposed to them.

Mr. BUNSTER. The Minister of Justice has alluded to British Columbia, but he knows very little of the expense of living in that Province. My remarks are intended for the Minister of Justice, in order to induce him to do justice to the Judges of British Columbia. They have to pay large fees indeed for servants, and when he draws comparison between Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, I am sure he is laboring under a mistake. I am astonished that the Minister of Justice has not done more justice to our Judges in British Columbia and increase their pay as well as that of the Judges in Nova Scotia. I dare say he has learned by this time that one of our Judges, who is a very able and much respected gentleman indeed, from the small pay he was getting, saw fit to better his condition in another country. He has left our flag, as I am credibly informed. It is the duty of the Government to give the Judges sufficient remuneration to enable them to keep up their establishments, as they do in Prince Edward Island and the other Provinces

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou). I fear my hon. friend from West Durham did not understand my argument, or I am quite sure he would not have insinuated that I was actuated by personal or unworthy motives in bringing down this resolution. I did not advocate at all raising the salaries of the Judges of the smaller Provinces to an equality with those of the Puisne Judges of the larger Provinces. My observation, to which my hon. friend referred, was with reference to the inequality between the salaries of the Judges of the smaller Provinces. I observed that personally I could not see why the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island should not receive the same salary as the Chief Justice of British Columbia, or Manitoba, or New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, but I did not in any way, so far as I can recollect, advocate raising the salaries of all the Judges to an equality with those now received by the Judges in the larger Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman and the House did not suppose I was making an imputation on him. I thought I was making a very innocent and not unpleasing joke. I am glad to see that there was so much earnest about it.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou), introduced a Bill (No. 95) to increase the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BLAKE. From what date is the increase to take place?

Mr. McDONALD, From the first of July next. Bill read the first time.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. MOUSSEAU, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 75) to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act, 1880 (from the Senate), said: When the hon leader of the Opposition asked for papers relating to this subject, he said he was experience has shown us that we have arrived at about the

opposed to the principle of this Bill unless it could be shown that it was in the interest of trade. I think it is not only in the interest of trade, but of public safety and of National Policy. The flash test is one necessary for the public safety, and after the experience of this and other countries, the gravity test is found to be a secondary precaution. It appears that there is a substance called paraffine in coal oil. The specific gravity of petroleum is increased by the presence of paraffine held in solution. The presence of paraffine in excess permits the presence of the lighter products of distillation in greater proportion than is consistent with safety without reducing the flash test so long as the paraffine is held in solution. An exposure to cold, say to a temperature of 15 degrees Fahrenheit, will crystallize the paraffine which is then precipitated, when the lighter products predominate, and the petroleum that previously stood the flash test, ceases to do so and becomes dangerous. It has also been found that petroleum which contains an excess of paraffine becomes dangerous in another way. The lamp wick becomes encrusted and its capillary action destroyed by the paraffine, and the circulation necessary while feeding the flame is impeded. As a consequence the wick holder is heated, the heat is communicated to the metallic parts of the lamp and thereby to the oil, and an explosive vapor is generated. Probably a greater number of lamp explosions originate in this way than in any other.

Mr. COLBY. It is obvious that the paramount consideration in legislation on this important subject should be that of the safety of the people who use the burning oil. was the object of the legislation of last year. recollect, prior to the assembling of Parliament last year, the large number of fearful and heartrending accidents that occurred all over the country. The attention of Parliament was called to the fact, and legislation was had, which was designed to insure to the people a safe burning oil. In that particular, the legislation has been eminently successful, for during the past year we have noted almost no accidents. In fact, I do not myself recollect to have seen in the newspapers the report of a single accident. Undoubtedly some have occurred that have not fallen under our observation, but I am sure we must all be aware that the danger of the use of coal oil has been very much lessened by the higher fire test and the higher gravity test adopted at the last Session of Parliament. But the effect of both of these tests, while they ensure safety, has been in the direction of enhancing the cost of the oil. There is no doubt that we can have a cheaper oil by removing both tests, but then we would have oil that would be as explosive and dangerous perhaps as gunpowder. The practical point for this Legislature to determine is what is the safety point, and this is one attended with a great deal of difficulty. is obviously so, because no laboratory experiment can determine this point. You cannot subject the oil to determine this point. You cannot subject the oil to any chemical tests that will correspond with the actual conditions existing in the country where the oil is used, because we know that the oil, in many instances, is ignorantly exposed to an inordinately high temperature. It is not unusual to find, in a country store, a lamp suspended near a stovepipe, and to see oil exposed in such a way that, unless it is absolutely safe, accidents must occur. Then again, a chemist cannot take accurate account of the actual condition of the lamps, burners, and other appliances made use of. Consequently, no office or laboratory experiment, with respect to either the fire test or the gravity test, can be an infallible guide. Any legislation on this subject must be tentative. Now. the question is, how far may we with prudence relax the test imposed last Session, so as in some degree to cheapen the cost of the oil? I am in favor of relaxing the gravity test; I am not in favor of relaxing the fire test. I think