

exactly two months to-day, and they have had ample time to consider it from all angles. Prior to the session hon. members of the official opposition, on the platform and through their press, made a stirring and eloquent appeal throughout Canada for economy—we must have economy, they said, if Canada was to be saved. And to-day we have those same hon. gentlemen urging upon the government on the one hand to jack up the tariff as high as Haman's gallows so that there will be no importations into Canada and consequently no revenue from the customs tariff—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Nobody here said so.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for East Toronto, a former member of the government of my right hon. friend who leads the opposition, advocated that this afternoon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. ROBB: But they are not advocating a reduction—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Excuse me; I happen to be the member for East Toronto.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), I should have said. Now, coming back to this question of oil bounties—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the minister was in when his leader this afternoon promised a new elevator at the coast.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is an election there.

Mr. ROBB: Coming back to this question of oil bounties, it has been represented to us that the oil industry of Canada is largely centred in two counties, Lambton and Kent, and we are told that to save the oil industry in the two counties of Lambton and Kent we must tax all the other people of those two counties and of all the other counties throughout Canada. The last speaker (Mr. LeSueur) who, I imagine, has the figures exactly, said that the production last year was 160,000 barrels. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition gave the figure this afternoon, as I understood him, as 167,000 barrels, so—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was the year before.

Mr. ROBB: Well, it is upon those figures that I base my estimate, and that is of that quantity 145,000 barrels were produced in

Lambton and in Kent. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) praised the Minister of Finance, Mr. Fielding, for his legislation in 1904 and damned him for his legislation of 1923.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBB: He was sure, he said, that the Minister of Finance intended to deal fairly with the oil industry of this country. Well, we have been subsidizing this oil industry now for twenty years; surely we have not dealt unfairly with it. It has been nurtured for twenty years. The impression was thrown out this afternoon that the oil bounties were to be altogether removed. The oil bounties by the legislation of last year were not altogether removed; they are cut in two, effective on the first of July of this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They stop in 1925.

Mr. ROBB: And they stop, under that legislation, at the end of July, 1925. It is represented to us to-day that this oil industry will be ruined if we cease the payment of \$42,000—because last year the total subsidy paid was only \$84,000 and if they have the same production this year they will receive \$42,000. So that unless they get another \$42,000 the oil business is going to be ruined. Well now, let us see to what extent this oil business is taken care of by the people of Canada. Emphasis was laid this afternoon upon the effect of any change in the bounty upon the farmers of Lambton and of Kent. Taking the production of 145,000 barrels in those two counties, according to the right hon. leader of the opposition the average price was \$2.62½ cents; that will mean \$381,000, and the government paid \$84,000. In other words to get a production of \$297,000 the government of this country has had to subsidize the industry to the extent of 28 per cent. We contributed 28 per cent of the total production of these oil fields, and to get that we are asked to tax all the other people in the counties of Lambton and Kent and all the other people of Canada. We are told by the former finance minister that if we do not do that the farmers of those counties will be ruined. Well, what about the farmers of the same county if the grass fails and there are no dairy products? What about the farmers of Kent if hog cholera comes in, as it did once before, and their hogs are all destroyed, or if there is an early frost and the corn crop is ruined? Are we going to subsidize these men in that case? It is just as logical to subsidize the one as to subsidize the other. Suppose rust comes along again this fall in western Canada and