

Mr. YOUNG: Could the minister give the committee an approximate figure?

Mr. STEVENS: To indulge in speculation of that kind would not be helpful. I should like to be accurate, and I regret that I have not the precise figures before me.

Mr. REID: How is this vote being disbursed to put Canadian coal used in the manufacture of iron and steel on a basis of equality with imported coal?

Mr. STEVENS: This vote covers the incidentals in connection with the administration of the act.

Mr. SPENCER: Is any coal being brought in from Germany?

Mr. STEVENS: I have no recollection of any being brought in from Germany.

Mr. RALSTON: In connection with the question asked by the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart) as to the amount of coal covered by the administration of this act—

Mr. STEVENS: I can give that information, but that was not the question.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I asked if there had been an increase.

Mr. RALSTON: Has the minister the amounts paid in bounties, and the tonnages? I believe there was a change in the bounty.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not believe there was a change. I have the figures for two years, which are as follows:

	Tonnage	Rate	Amount
1930-31	273,148	at 49½ cents per ton	\$135,209 23
1931-32	125,798	at 49½ cents per ton	62,269 98

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it the act has been in force only two years.

Mr. YOUNG: I think the committee should know what this equalization process is costing at the different points in Canada where there are large steel plants, as at Sydney, Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie. It may be possible that there would be discrimination against certain plants, and I suggest that this item should stand until my question is answered.

Mr. STEVENS: The only tonnage on which bounty has been paid is that which I have indicated, and that was paid to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Item agreed to.

British and foreign news service, \$32,000.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. EULER: I note this item shows no decrease over last year. I was one of many objectors last year to this item. At that time it was claimed that full value was not being received for the money spent, and I am still of that opinion. I believe the reason given last year was that this was a contractual obligation; is that still the case?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. EULER: I hope that when the contract expires it will not be renewed; how long has it to run?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I add my protest to that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I recall on one

occasion when the late Mr. Robb was Minister of Trade and Commerce that he withdrew this item but subsequently it had to be reinserted because it was a matter of contract. I do not think this country should be tied up over any long period with a contract of this character as I do not believe we are getting value for the money spent.

Mr. STEVENS: This contract was entered into on March 31, 1930; it was to run three years, so that it will expire on April 1, 1933.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Cut it off.

Mr. CANTLEY: At a time when we are cutting all services I submit that this contract ought to be revised, if not cancelled altogether.

Item agreed to.

Electricity and gas inspection service, \$211,000.

Mr. VENIOT: Does this include salaries?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: Why does not the 10 per cent cut appear there?

Mr. STEVENS: There is a cut there.

Mr. VENIOT: Where does it appear? At the bottom of the details of all the other departments appear the words "less 10 per cent." But that does not appear here. It is not following out the practice that has been adopted with respect to the other items. There is nothing here to indicate that there is to be a cut in salaries. There is a cut in the amount of the vote, but it may be for anything else but salaries. Let us have the details of the vote.

W.L.M. King Papers, Memoranda and Notes, 1933-1939 (M.G. 26, J 4, volume 150, pages C108741-C109340)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
 ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
 CANADA