

What I wanted to get at was briefly this: A large sum of money has been paid out in the shape of bounties for the production of lead, almost entirely in the province of British Columbia pursuant to a policy adopted some years ago and still adhered to. I wanted to get the amount of lead production by the several producers in British Columbia for each year during which the bounty has been effective and also the amount of lead on which they have been paid the bounty, and the amount of the bounty paid to each of these producers each year. The information which has been brought down does not give the amount of lead produced by these producers each year, it simply gives the amount upon which they were paid bounty, but of course the House sees in a moment that this is very different from the amount they produced. My object in asking for the amount paid each year by each of these producers was that we might see whether the policy had had the effect of stimulating the industry, whether it had grown under the application of the bounty. Inasmuch as these figures are not given, the lesson cannot be deduced. All that the House knows is simply that these producers in British Columbia, and to a small extent in Ontario, were paid so much each year but as there were years during which they were paid no bounty and may have been parts of each year for several years in which they were paid no bounty, the information as I said is not given which would enable us to make any inference as to the effect on the production of ore of the payment of the bounty.

I should have thought that the government when they started on a policy of stimulating the production of lead in British Columbia would have been anxious to have had all the elements of information necessary to prove to them whether their policy had resulted in doing what it was aimed to do and had really helped the industry to a further development. I would suggest to the minister now that from this time on he should require from every lead producer in British Columbia a return as to the total amount of lead produced by him during each year. Then at the end of the period which is set by this Act we may have the elements which are lacking now.

However, we glean something from the statement which has been brought down. We find that there were 147 producers who received a greater or less payment. But 112 of these received a very small amount indeed, an amount so small that one can scarcely believe that it had any effect whatever in helping the industry. When you also take into account that these payments, small as they were were in a great majority of cases for only one year and commonly the first year, 1903-4, it will be seen still more plainly how slight an effect the bounty must have had with reference to

Mr. FOSTER.

production so far as these producers were concerned. For instance the Sandon Sovereign was paid a bounty in the whole five years of only \$260.57 and that entirely in the first year, 1903-4. The 'Province' received only \$539 during those five years and that also in the first year. The Echo received only \$129; the Netty L. \$391; the Florida \$137; the Mohican \$36.70; the Gold Bug \$1.71; the Horseshoe \$34.44; the Bosun \$528.66. All of these received this whole payment in the first year 1903-4 and received nothing thereafter, indicating I should think, inasmuch as other producers are paid bounty during the other years, that these had ceased producing after the year 1903-4. Then we have the Wilcox which received about \$500 in the five years, the first year receiving \$584, the second year \$19.88 and none thereafter, indicating that it had ceased producing after 1904-5. The Bonnie Bell received \$27.38 in 1904-5, and none in any other year. The Bounty received \$5.46 in 1904-5 and none in any other year; the Baltimore received \$22 in all during the two years 1904-5, 1905-6; the Helen received only \$45 in all; the Evening Star received only \$21.74 in all; the California received \$367.41; the Rambler received \$11.82; the Revenue received \$37.06; the Highlander \$93.62; the Montezuma \$84.14; the Queen \$22.48; the E. P. U. \$72.58; the Arlington \$163.27; the British Columbia and Tilbury \$50.30; the Krao \$348.69, and that in one single year; the Neepawa received very small amounts, about \$100 in all; the Pontiac received about \$180 in all; the No. 1 Mine received \$29 in all; the Daniel received \$28.82 in all; the Silver Bell received \$39.88 in all; the Wonderful Group received \$86 and \$79 in two different years and none thereafter; the Blue Bell received \$95.52, all in 1905-6; the Coronado received \$14.36; the I. X. L. received about \$78; the Delphine received about \$350; the Noble Five received \$6.93 in five years; the Lorna Doon received about \$200 in the five years; the Whitewater Deep received \$95.44 in the first year and none thereafter, until in the last year it received \$1,022.54; the Waverley received \$11.74 in all; the Eva, \$7.96; the Elkhorn No. 2, \$26.84 and so on with a large number of others, making in all a total of 112 of these producers which received these very small amounts, and commonly in the first and second years that the bounty was in effect.

Then we come to twenty-nine producers which received sums of money for bounty irregularly through the different years to a larger amount, producing 100,000 pounds and upwards of ore. Then we come to the six large producers, the Highland Kootenay which produced in the first year 4,941,075 pounds and received a subsidy or bounty of \$37,058.05 and in the second year produced 720,561 pounds, receiving a bounty of \$5,-