

if those who are engaged in refining oil in Ontario, instead of seeking a factitious and unreasonable protection, under the guise of a fire test, were to endeavour to compete with the American oil in the quality of their own production under the very high protection which the Tariff gives, they would succeed better. They have to day a protection on their oil of 6c. a gallon, when oil is worth in New York only 7½c. They have a protection of nearly 100 per cent. If that is not enough, and if this House is willing to give them more, let them come to this House and ask it straight. But this disguised protection, which compels us to pay a higher price for an inferior article, is a double injury to us. It is far better that we should pay an additional 4c. a gallon as a direct protection, and have the privilege of buying the best illuminating oil wherever we choose, than to be compelled to pay 4c. a gallon more for an inferior oil as we now do. This is precisely the condition of affairs that I—in the interest of a large body of consumers in the Lower Provinces and along our extended frontier, who prefer to use American oil until our Canadian producers give us something better—am endeavouring to rectify. But it affects all those who consume Canadian oil as well. Do Canadian oil refiners give their customers a better article than they did last year, because there happened to be legislation that suited them? I have yet to learn that they do. Do they give it to them at a lower price? I have that also to learn that they do. I believe that the injustice of the present discriminating test bears just as heavily upon the consumers of Canadian as of American oil. Now, I would not willingly or wantonly add one straw's weight to the difficulties under which those gentlemen in Petrolia are labouring; I believe they are having a hard time of it, and we ought not to disregard the claims they have upon the consideration of the country. They are pumping oil out of wells that yield them but two to four barrels per day, in competition with American wells that yield 40 barrels per day. Our refiners are obliged to use a crude oil that costs \$1.12 a barrel, as against the American refiner who buys at 75c. or 80c. a barrel, while the American crude yields a larger percentage of illuminating oil than does the Canadian. I have a firm belief that

MR. COLBY.

Canadian crude oil is susceptible of making just as good an illuminating oil as the American crude, and would do so but for the greed of the refiner who takes 50 per cent. of illuminating oil out of the crude oil when he should take but 40 per cent. The 10 per cent. so improperly taken consists largely of paraffine and other constituents, which impairs the illuminating quality. If the Canadian refiner would take 10 per cent less of refined oil from his crude, and charge 5c. a gallon more for it, he would find hundreds of purchasers among people who will not buy his oil now at any price. Canadian oil is a more lasting oil, and people would buy it in preference to American oil, if it was equal in its illuminating properties and somewhat free from offensive odour. They would have the advantage of nearly 20 per cent. in durability. Considering the difficulties which beset them, I certainly do not wish to state the case unfairly against them or in anyway do them an injustice. But the hon. members of this House, mostly, represent the consumers of oil. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), in whose constituency most of the oil is produced, the hon. member for Middlesex, and the hon. member for London, and one or two other hon. gentlemen, are the only gentleman who represent the producers. We are told the Canadian refiners cannot live under the present protective duty of 6c. per gallon. I am very sorry they cannot live under it. I am sorry the wells are so poor; but if the industry cannot live, if we have to be taxed excessively, in order to keep them alive, the question has to be considered: is it better the industry should be supported and bolstered up by oppressive taxation upon all the people of the country, or that it should rest for a time until the unprecedented flow of American oil wells shall have been exhausted.

MR. ANGLIN: This is treason against the "N.P."

MR. COLBY: It is not treason against the "N.P." I am sorry my hon. friend has made that remark, because it compels me to speak a little longer in explanation of my views. I know many other persons have made the same remark. They have said, Mr. Colby takes an anomalous position in advocating Protection and being a Free-trader in respect to oil. Well, this