

on both. Now, it was said that we accomplished nothing. I have shown what I accomplished almost single-handed—yes, single-handed. By pressing the Government in regard to binder twine and implements in years past, I got my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance to put implements down to 20 per cent, and reduce the duty on binder twine and barbed wire 50 per cent, and I was confident had they remained in power to get implements, lumber—all those things free. A Tory Government, on protectionist principles, pressed by me, reduced implements from 35 per cent to 20 per cent at one stroke, while a Liberal Government does not take a cent of duty off, but gives some additional protection to the manufacturer. That is the difference between them. Look at this picture, and then on that, the counterfeit presentment of two Finance Ministers—one an honest protectionist and Conservative, who says he will do the best he can for the country, the other a blatant free trader, who went from one end of his own province to the other proclaiming himself a free trader and leading a party many members of which declared that there should be no duty on coal oil, as it was one of the necessities of life. I heard the Postmaster General make that declaration; and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in and out of this House, declared that coal oil ought to be free. Yet, what do we find? We find two Finance Ministers—the one a Tory, if you will, who takes 15 per cent off; the other, after having promised, vicariously and directly to remove the duty, does nothing at all but strengthen the hands of the supposed enemy of the farmer. One is an honest statesman; the other is—well, you can describe him as you please. In 1894 the ex-Finance Minister brought down his revision of the tariff, and there was a general discussion in regard to coal oil, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) leading the way. The tax, he said, bore with special weight on the maritime provinces; and I am told that in Halifax the changes were rung on the duty on coal oil until coal oil seemed to be the great staple of discussion in that contest. The duty before the reduction of the late Government was a specific duty of seven and one-fifth cents per gallon. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries asserted that the protection amounted to 123 per cent on the coal oil imported into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and he concluded with a touching appeal for sweeping away the enormous monopoly. This is what he said—and I wish I could imitate the Boanergean style in which, with the echo of the sea in his ears, he thundered out:

I plead on behalf of the mass of the people; not on behalf of the rich people in the cities and towns, who have their electric light and gas, but for the great mass of the people, who are obliged

Mr. DAVIN.

to buy this oil. This is class legislation of the worst kind. It bears most seriously upon the maritime provinces, and it bears with enormous weight upon the poorer classes in the maritime provinces.

Yet the present Government have 5 cents a gallon on it still, or about 80 per cent, with no sign that it is to be swept away. I see my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) smiling. I do not think we shall hear from him about coal oil. He is one of the distributors of the coal oil, and they are as much responsible for the high price of coal oil in the North-west as anybody else. My hon. friend has about 20 cents on every gallon of coal oil he sells: and yet he is a friend not only of the Government, but of those who properly talk so much about the burdensome and extravagant duty. Mr. Casey was also eloquent upon the subject. He said that the oil producers in the west were ringsters and combinesters. The duty on petroleum he declared to be a protection of 150 per cent, which was outrageous and should be cut down at least one-half. Now, what is the result of all this now? The duty is reduced from 6 to 5 cents per gallon on the refined and from 3 cents to 2½ cents per gallon on the crude. The duty of 6 cents a gallon, which was hitherto enforced, the Liberals declared to be a protection of 100 per cent, and a measure of extortion which the late Government allowed the combines to practise on the people at large. But now they have a protection of from 80 to 85 per cent in the shape of 5 cents per gallon. I spoke a short time ago about the mesmeric influence of polite society on my Patron friend, who wanted to interject something that was not a point of order. I should like to know whether the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has mesmerized his colleagues and the Government and converted them to his views on this subject. I hope that on Tuesday next, as the result of the ventilation of these things in this House, we shall see coal oil on the free list in the revised tariff which is to be brought before us, or else greatly reduced. I hope, above all, that we shall see lumber on the free list, which, the other day, I moved should be put on that list. Sir, that duty upon lumber is a fearful impost on settlers in those prairies out west. All you have to do, when you have 20 per cent upon lumber, is to divide the cost of a farm house on these vast prairies by five, and the quotient gives you what is paid into the treasury by the farmer. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) told us in his speech in the rink at Winnipeg how this duty pressed heavily on the farmers. He knows well that there is a combine not far from Winnipeg, and I hope we shall have his influence in the direction in which I am now pleading. There is a gentleman in this House who is no longer capable of taking part in our debates, owing to his high office, but who, in other years, eloquently discoursed upon the necessity of