imagine five barrels a day with a bonus of 52½ cents a barrel, a total amount of $2.60 a day that each well could earn. The whole idea was to make it clear that the class of people we wanted to help were the small producers who could not otherwise carry on —that and that alone. Moreover, if a great gusher was found in the West or in the north, it would be entitled only to $2.60 a day, so that all fear was removed of any injury to the treasury had that proposal been adopted. Well, it was not, and my right hon. friend, although pressed for it, could not and did not give any reason why it should not be adopted. Now I come back to Mr. Greenizen. He proceeds:

It is now nearly a year since Mr. Fielding delivered this speech. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in the search for oil in the West but without a favourable result. Investigation of the position of the crude oil produced would have shown a much diminished production as compared with 1904, and that owing to the increased cost of labour and supplies it was costing nearly three times as much to get this production as it cost in 1904, and such investigation would further have shown the impossibility of carrying on at a profit without the bounty. We believe that if Mr. Fielding had seen his way clear to protect the treasury against the possibility of large production, and at the same time protect our industry here, he would have continued the bounty. We suggest that the act passed last session be repealed and the bounty restored, with the proviso that such bounty shall only apply to wells and groups of wells producing an average per well of one barrel or less per day.

That is a most modest request, a far more modest request than the real legitimate claim of the district entitles them to. That cuts it down to a bounty of 52½ cents per day. It seems too small altogether, but even that small consideration has been denied. It goes on:

This will enable producers here to carry on. The government cannot be charged with sectionalism in the legislation.

10. Our oil production for the year 1923 was 158,511 barrels. If the removal of the bounty results in closing down our wells this oil will have to be replaced by purchase from United States producers, at a cost of about $400,000 per year.

11. I am unable to state definitely the number of workmen employed in the industry, but I believe several hundred men derive their livelihood directly and indirectly from the business.

12. Our oil fields have been a training school for oil well drillers. Many of these find employment in the oil fields in different foreign countries. Their drilling contracts are usually for a term of three years, and their families remain here and considerable sums of money are returned to this country from this source.

13. Property owners in the town of Petrolia and in other producing districts in Ontario will suffer a serious loss if our wells are forced to close, as most of our workmen employed about the wells would be forced to leave, and no doubt most of them would secure employment in different fields in the United States.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I point out that this is not the opinion of a Conservative politician, but of a Liberal politician, who says, and says deliberately, that the direct effect of this legislation is to deny employment and to further assist in the process of expatriating the Canadian. I further point out, so clear from all doubt is the real situation here, that during the whole of his submissions to this government he has done only one thing, and that is to absolutely endorse the position taken by us in this section of the House when this legislation was proposed. The file I have does not show why or on what ground relief has not been extended to these people.

There were other documents also put before my hon. friend. We have a document here which further reinforces Mr. Greenizen's appeal. Before reading that I am going to read from a statement which shows the average price received per barrel of crude petroleum each year, but omitting the bounty, the cost of production, the net profit or loss per barrel. The statement goes back as far as the year 1905, and its effect is to show just where these small producers would be without the bounty:

Year	Price ex-Bounty	Cost per barrel	Loss per barrel	Profit per barrel
1905..	1.29	1.347	.057	....
1906..	1.328	1.448	.12	....
1907..	1.337	1.62	.283	....
1908..	1.421	1.43	.009	....
1909..	1.288	1.54	.252	....
1910..	1.214	1.66	.446	....
1911..	1.225	1.467	.242	....
1912..	1.457	1.55	.093	....
1913..	1.793	1.59	....	.203
1914..	1.505	1.612	.107	....
1915..	1.42	1.742	.322	....
1916..	1.99	1.691	....	.299
1917..	2.335	2.20	....	.135
1918..	2.675	2.60	....	.075
1919..	2.81	2.322	....	.488
1920..	4.097	3.51	....	.587
1921..	2.662	2.736	.074	....
1922..	2.663	2.541	....	.122

Average for period 1.815.

Apart from the bounty, 11 years of the 18 produced crude at a loss and 7 years at a small profit.

The aggregate profits for the whole period, exclusive of bounty, amounted to 12 per cent on the capital invested, an average of 2-3 of one per cent per year. No charge has been made for depreciation or depletion of the properties and no large salaries paid.

During this period the bounty in the aggregate was 84 per cent of the whole profits and 29 per cent of the full price received by us from the purchasers.

Now that statement, which was filed with my hon. friend, was made by the Canada Crude Oil producers, Limited, signed by W. McIntosh, Secretary-Treasurer. It shows at least that there are no undue profits being made, and on its face it bears out what I