

tariff excluding foreign imports, then, in proportion as competition was limited by that exclusion, the local manufacturer could raise prices. There must, therefore, if you have a protective policy, be an ideal tariff which you must seek. There must be a tariff, moving along the ridge of which you will give that protection to native industries which will foster them and keep them healthy, and at the same time protect the people from the grasping policy of the manufacturer, protect the people from being mulcted in the goods they buy by being made to pay more for them than they ought. Any man, looking over the existing tariff and carefully comparing it with the tariff of 1883 in the United States, or 1890, or with the tariffs in Europe, or comparing one part of our own tariff with another part, cannot fail to come to the conclusion, that if we are to have a fairly good protective tariff—because that is all, I suppose, in practical affairs we can have—an ideal, a perfect tariff being so difficult to frame as to be really an impossibility—our present tariff needs very thorough and careful revision. It is not my business at present to show in what cases it would be necessary to make that revision, other than the points which relate to my present motion; but I will say this generally, that whenever you have a commodity which enters largely into the manufacture of goods, and where you have that article taxed—where it is the raw material of many industries—if you want to foster the production and manufacture of that article in the country, the proper way to do it is by means of bonuses. The commodity itself should be admitted free in order to protect the manufacture of the great variety of articles into which it enters. I ventured on a previous occasion, to which I may without impropriety refer, to say ‘a priori’ a combine must be condemned, and that above all a Government which has adopted a protective policy and a House of Commons which has pledged its majority to that policy, must strike at that combine. The other day, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland) proposed to abolish the duty on oil. That is further than I would go. I agree with the hon. member for the east riding of Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) that this oil industry is a most important one, and that it has been built up with extraordinary rapidity to its present state of prosperity. I agree that it is in some respects, although a local industry, a national concern. I admit all that, but, as I followed the reasoning of my hon. friend the other afternoon, I could not help thinking of one of the characters in Dryden’s comedy, a distressed and sentimental maiden, who says: “My wound is great because it is so small,” and of the Duke of Buckingham who, rising in his box, said: “Then ’twould be greater were it none at all.” Now the converse is the kind of reasoning the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) indulged in. He pointed out that because the protec-

tion of coal oil was so enormous, the industry had made such great progress, and the inference which he would appear to press is that no oil from the outside should be admitted at all, and then it would be still more prosperous. If there was complete protection and complete exclusion; in fact, if you could blot out the sun and destroy the manufacture of candles and shut down on the electric light factories, his industry would be still more prosperous, although I fear it would be unequal to the demand for light in Canada. As I followed my hon. friend and as I read a paper sent to me by those gentlemen engaged in the manufacture of oil, I could not but be struck by this, that they, on the very question of tariff, as good as give up their whole case. They admit that they have an enormous protection. The manufacturers, when interviewed by trustworthy persons, one of whom is a Conservative and one a Reformer, admitted—and I do not think there can be any doubt about it—that they cannot produce as fine a quality of oil as the United States manufacturers and they cannot produce a sufficient quantity of the oil they do manufacture. They admit that, but they make statements as to the cost of bringing in the oil which I do not think are borne out by the facts, because I went and made inquiry. I made inquiries of some of the merchants inside and outside Ottawa, and I found that not only have you the 7½ cents duty on coal oil, but you pay 40 cents for each barrel; and I will remind my hon. friend the Finance Minister, that at one time it was 20 per cent and then 40 cents was charged, but that the merchants waited on him and urged a return of 20 cents, as the barrel was worth only \$1, and then an arrangement was made to charge 40 cents on the barrel to protect still further my hon. friend’s (Mr. Moncrieff’s) clients in Petrolea. Now, the way the importers of coal oil and the people of Canada want to have that imported is in tank-cars. If it is imported in tank-cars this charge of 40 cents for the barrel is saved. The tank-car can be run to a terminal point in Canada, and, in fact, the tanks can be taken about the streets, as in the United States, and coal oil measured out to the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, the calculation made by my hon. friend in regard to the cost of coal oil is hardly borne out by the fact. I have here a calculation of what it costs to bring in oil. The invoice cost of sixty barrels of refined oil is \$159.86, less 1 per cent for cash, \$158.26; freight to Ottawa, \$64.70, so that 2,640 gallons cost, in bond, \$222.96, or say, 84½ cents per Imperial gallon; duty on 2,640 gallons at 7½ cents per gallon, \$190.08; sixty barrels at 40 cents each, \$24; inspection fees, 30 cents per barrel, \$18; cartage from station, \$7.20; total, \$239.28, which, added to the cost of the oil, makes \$462.24, or say, 17.89 cents per Imperial gallon. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you add the freight to that, we can understand why it is that in Regina we pay 40 cents per