

ducers in my district for having taken that sensible view. We have our corroding works established in Montreal, where an American firm have invested between \$150,000 and \$200,000, coming into Canada with their usual enterprise and spending their money in putting up works there. They are now starting the production, they are already turning out a little. The machinery is new, and as is the case with all new plants, it takes a little time before they get under full headway. But they are met with this situation the present year, that, anticipating the probable adjustment of the duty on corroded lead, the mixers and grinders of paint in Canada have pretty well stocked themselves up with corroded lead, either from the United States or from the markets of London; and had the government delayed the adjustment of this matter until the commission had sat and considered it, even had the report of the commission been favourable, by the delay we would have lost the same amount of trade next year for our corroding works in Canada that we do lose and will lose this year.

Now I believe in giving credit where credit is due. In 1903 we came from my own district in British Columbia, where practically all the lead mining of British Columbia is carried on; we came to the government and asked for assistance to our industry. It is true that the consensus of opinion at first was in favour of imposing a heavy duty on lead and lead products coming into Canada. As was stated the other night by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), I advocated that, and I spoke upon the subject after the delivery of the budget speech that year, and pointed out the necessity of something being done in the interest of the lead mining industry. The government at that time, in their wisdom, did not see their way clear to meet our demands in respect of duties. We then presented to them an alternative proposition, that of a bounty. I am bound to say, and I can assure this House that I am speaking as the mouthpiece of the lead producers of the district I represent, that practically all the lead producers of the district I represent are unanimous in the opinion that the aid granted to that industry by the Dominion government in the shape of a bounty, was the best possible mode of dealing with this question, not only from the standpoint of the impetus which was given to the development of their lead mines, but also from the standpoint of the actual profits to them as miners of lead. They agree that it was the best policy that could be adopted by the government, and that no duties which could have been imposed, no matter how prohibitive, would have answered the same purpose and have produced the same good results. When we came here and represented to the government what would follow if aid was granted by them to that industry, we predicted that an impetus would be

given to the industry. Let us see if that prediction has been borne out. In the year ending June 30, 1903, the year in which the Bounty Act was passed, the production of lead in Canada was, I believe, about 7,000 tons; whereas, for the year ending June 30, 1905, the fiscal year just passed, the production of lead increased to 27,000 tons, notwithstanding that during the winter of 1904 and the following summer we suffered a great deal from lack of water, and had to shut down certain of our large concentrating plants, and consequently were able to show a lesser production than we otherwise would. At all events, our showing of 27,000 tons this last year is more than triple the production under the aid granted by the government than it was in 1903.

Some one may say: Is it all due to that bounty being granted? I am not going to claim that it is all due to that, but I claim that the greater part of it was due to the bounty granted by the government and that next year we anticipate the output of 27,000 tons will be increased to 40,000 tons, so I think our contention that when we came to the government with regard to the impetus that would be given to the lead mining has been well borne out. We also stated that it would result in the establishment and the enlargement of refineries right in the lead producing district which would refine every pound of lead produced in British Columbia. That also has taken place. Not only are they able to refine the lead produced in British Columbia, but they are also refining copper, gold and silver in the same works. I have further stated and one of the most important things urged was that it would result in the establishment of corroding works in Canada, so that we would take our ore containing lead right from the mines and put it through the different process of smelting, refining and finally corroding, that we would be able to treat our product entirely in Canada and supply every pound of lead to be used in this country in any shape, lead pipe, paint, sheet lead or any other form. That has been further borne out. We have, as I say, our corroding works here, due, I must say, to the enterprise of a firm of Americans from Wisconsin, and I am pleased indeed to see that the government have recognized the advisability of remedying the inconsistency in tariff which existed with regard to the duty imposed on dry white lead.

There is just one other subject of which I propose to treat, and that one is a most vexed question. For some two or three years, both in this House and out of it, I have been an advocate of duties on rough lumber. This affects us more particularly in the province of British Columbia and I may say that I have been persistent in my requests to the different ministers of the government, individually and collectively; in fact, I may have at times constituted myself more or less of a nuisance by my persistence. This is not a pre-election advo-