

one-eighth, that is not placing the matter in a true light.

Mr. MANION: The farmer may think so.

Mr. FANSHER: It reminds me a great deal of the argument put up by my hon. friends to my right in regard to the home market—their argument that the home market is of great benefit to the farmer, when in reality it is not. I was going to observe that the larger portion of the bounty goes into the hands of comparatively few men or few companies. Fifteen companies get the major portion of the oil bounty paid. Without giving the names of the companies, I wish to give a few of the amounts of bounties paid to oil operators in the riding of East Lambton for eleven months of the last fiscal year. They are as follows: \$2,225, \$2,594, \$2,181, \$4,805, \$2,688, \$1,592, \$3,657, \$3,469, \$1,200, \$6,337, \$4,383, and \$2,104. These are amounts that are over \$1,000; but many of the amounts paid the farmers are below \$100. The main purpose of my rising on this occasion is to correct the impression that these oil bounties are of such great benefit to the farmers as we are led to believe. It has been said in the course of the debate that regardless of all political parties in that section of the country which is to-day engaged in oil production the people are unanimously in favour of the retention of oil bounties. I wish to inform my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) that this is not the case. The oil industry in Lambton county has long passed the development stage; the territory has been fairly well tested to a depth of at least 400 feet and deep drilling has not taken place to any large extent.

Mr. PUTNAM: Can the hon. member tell us approximately how many farmers benefit at all from the bounties?

Mr. FANSHER: I am sorry I cannot give the exact number but I know I am well within the mark when I say that in the riding of East Lambton there are not more than 100 farmers receiving any benefit from oil bounties. There are only about 150 who receive cheques for bounties and of that number some 15 or 20 would be companies operating wells.

Mr. CALDWELL: And the companies get the major portion of it.

Mr. FANSHER: Yes, they get seven-eighths of it. We are very much concerned in the development of this country; and speaking for myself I am interested and

[Mr. Fansher.]

concerned in the development of East Lambton; I want to see the oil industry there also develop. At the same time, however, a bounty to the extent of at least one-fifth of the selling price of the article when placed on the market is away beyond the extent of the benefit which we receive as a nation from the industry. Hence, although this industry is situated within the riding I represent, I cannot see the justice of giving assistance to the extent of one-fifth of the selling price of the crude oil. Crude oil is sold at from \$2 to \$2.50 and upwards a barrel and the bounty is 52½ cents a barrel. On the other hand, I do not think that this industry should be left to shift for itself while the refining end of the business enjoys a protection of from ½ cent to 2 cents a gallon. We should not make fish of one and flesh of another; they should all be on the same footing. I hope to see the day when the duty on refined oil will be reduced in this country so that the consumer may have some benefit in this direction.

Mr. MANION: I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the last speaker, and until shortly before the conclusion of his speech I had no idea where he stood on the question of oil bounties in his constituency, which is particularly affected. I drew the conclusion from the last remarks he made that as things stand to-day he favours the continuance of the bounties as they are. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. FANSHER: No hon. member who listened to my remarks can draw that inference from them; I do not stand for the continuance of the oil bounties as they are. The oil bounties constitute a protection at the expense of the public for the benefit of a few, the major part of those engaged in the industry being men who have amassed considerable wealth out of it, some of them indeed owning oil fields in foreign countries. Knowing them as I do, I believe a number of them would still be far better off without the bounty than those who are taxed to provide that bounty.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): It will take me but a few minutes to present a viewpoint which the last speaker omits. I should have thought that he would have a more comprehensive understanding of the question in issue, coming as he does from a district which is so vitally affected. He seems to take the view that inasmuch as the farmers rent their land for the most part, only a few of them actually produc-