

thing between 130 ° and 150 ° would, probably, be the sort of oil that would be admitted by the 115 ° flash test. There would be a difference of 1½c. to 2c. between those two oils—the sort now admitted, and that which the Bill proposed would admit—in the cost price, caused by the difference in the flashing point. This is quite a serious difference, if it can be shown that the lower of these two oils is safe. But the hon. member for Stanstead has shown that the difference is greater, because a special grade has to be manufactured at an extra cost. This was an unnecessary tax on the people of Canada, because they dare not buy ordinary Canadian oil, and had to buy the American, the cost of which is artificially increased by the present law. I think, then, there is no necessity for discrimination as to the flash test between Canadian and American oils. If there was a burning test, there would need to be a discrimination of 10 °, according to the figures of my informant. It will be incumbent on the advocates of the present discrimination to show grounds for it, in public opinion, which they have failed to do. The member for East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) says the Canadian oil burns more slowly. That does not show it is safer. It is, however, better value for its cost. That is a considerable protection for the Canadian dealer, as every consumer wishes to economise in the consumption of oil. I think the late Government gave a great boon to the country in abolishing the Excise on this oil, and breaking up the coal oil ring. I shall have great pleasure in supporting the Bill of the member for Stanstead, and I hope the Minister of Inland Revenue will consider the suggestion of both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this measure (Mr. Colby and Mr. Macmillan), and of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Flynn), in regard to the inspection and seizure of bad oils and kindred matters.

MR. LONGLEY: Nothing connected with the Tariff has produced so much dissatisfaction in the Lower Provinces as the raising of the standard of American oil. This was done through the agency of a Bill passed during the last hours of the last Session; which seems not to have attracted the attention of anyone outside of the promoters thereof. In truth it was scarcely open, straightfor-

ward legislation, which thus, practically, secured to the Ontario refiners double protection. We do not much object to the duty of 6c. per gallon on American oil, though we may think it a pretty steep protection on an article worth only from eight to ten cents per gallon at the place of production; but when an attempt was made to give a double protection to the Canadian article by making a distinction of twenty-five degrees between the standard of American and Canadian oils, it need be no matter of surprise that the people of the Lower Provinces should protest against such an imposition. The Bill which we are now considering proposes a uniform standard for Canadian and American illuminating oils; and proposes to fix the standard at 115 ° Fahrenheit's thermometer. This standard will be generally accepted as fair and right, and will be attended with satisfaction. It is matter for general regret that, up to the present time the Canadian refiners have not succeeded in producing a really good and pure article of illuminating oil, equal to the American article, and the result has been that a great preference has been shown for the American oil. The Canadian refiners seem confident that they can bring their oil up to a standard equal to that of the American oil, and it is to be hoped that they will do so; for it is not very creditable to Canadian enterprise that their products should not more favourably compare with those of their neighbours across the border. For these and other reasons which might be urged, I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead.

MR. KILLAM: I think I owe an explanation to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) for asking him what he expected his Bill was going to accomplish. I was afraid the Government, whose avowed policy is to tax certain industries for the benefit of others, and who pushed this oil legislation through the House last year in some mysterious manner, might allow it to slip by this year without taking any action upon it, and that the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead might be found among the slaughtered innocents. I am sure we are all obliged to the hon. gentleman for the manner in which he has explained this matter to the House. I do not profess to have any