

ment. Another question worthy of consideration is the quality of the oil. I am free to admit that the quality of Canadian oil some years ago was not so good as it is to-day. But I am satisfied, and my opinion will be supported by many members of this House who have used Canadian oil, that Canada produces a first-class burning oil, and that those who use it are perfectly satisfied. Another important point is that our oil is, as a rule, a safer oil for burning purposes than the imported article, and the oil we supply to the public is an article that does not consume so quickly as the light grade of American oil that comes into this country. To the farmer and to all classes of the people who want a good reliable light, a safe and economical oil, I defy them to find any better on the continent of America than we can give them in the county of Lambton. I admit, Sir, that there are in this country and in the United States different grades of oil. We have a good, honest, economical, family oil in this country, and we have another grade called "extra" or "water-white." Did you ever find two qualities of oil in the United States? If you will ask any of your American neighbours you will find that there are two qualities there. The Standard Oil Co. are making a refined oil out of "Lima crude," which is bought at 17 or 18 cents a barrel, and forcing it over the country, but on the other hand they have first-class oil, a good water-white oil, and it is that quality that is mostly imported into this country. I may ask, why is that best quality mostly imported? Did you ever see any article imported into a foreign country of the poorest quality when the manufacturer wants to build up a trade in the foreign country? Are the worst qualities of Bass' ale and Guinness' Dublin stout sent to Canada to compete with the ales of local manufacture? No; they send their very best qualities. Is it not always understood that when the foreign manufacturer tries to secure a market he invariably sends the very best quality of the article which he produces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at six o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

Bill (No. 26) relating to the harbour of Thornbury, on the Georgian Bay.—(Mr. Sproule.)

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the past fiscal year, from the 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Haggart.)

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider proposed resolutions (p. 357) relative to the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not propose at this stage to offer any comment upon this measure, but I now inform the hon. gentleman that at some later stage, probably upon the second reading of this Bill, I shall take an opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the whole system of superannuation. The system of superannuation casts altogether too large a burden on the people of the country, and I venture to suggest at this moment to the hon. gentleman that we shall do our duty if we pass the whole system under review and substitute another, which will be more in accordance with the requirements of the service, as well as of the country.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance may as well inform the committee what the total amount of revenue will be, if the resolution should be adopted and embodied in the form of a Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. That somewhat depends on circumstances. This resolution is introduced upon which to found a bill which will be submitted to the House, if the House approves of this resolution, and the sole purpose of the Government in bringing this measure down is to obviate the burdens of the superannuation system. Hon. members on both sides of the House agree that the system which has been in vogue for a number of years has been a burdensome one. Each year its burdens are becoming more and more apparent. In speaking on this question the other day I gave some reasons as to why this system had become so burdensome, and it is not necessary to repeat them. Probably in the course of the discussion which will arise on the Bill, or on the motion which the hon. leader of the Opposition has announced he will make, these facts may be more fully brought out. If it had not been for that desire to meet what is the opinion of the Government, and I believe the opinion of the House, that the present system is too burdensome, and that it must be abolished or some