

would do away with the grievance that I was alleging in connection with the countervailing duties. That is not so. The coal is not classified simply as coal when it goes into the United States, but as lignite or bituminous or anthracite, and a duty on one would not affect the other. There are two situations, the bituminous coal situation and the lignite situation. The lignite coal came in for years free of duty. The Finance minister in his budget the other day put on a duty of 40 cents a ton. Later he took that off, so we are left exactly as we were before, with no duty on lignite entering Canada and no duty on the Canadian products entering the United States. It would help us if it was classified properly and made liable to the bituminous duty.

The bituminous coal situation was this. We paid a duty of 50 cents a ton going into the United States, on a countervailing basis. When we raised our duty from 50 cents to 75 cents a ton, automatically, without any action by congress, the Americans raised their duty to 75 cents also. That cuts off a trade for us, not of 17,000 tons, but of 48,850 tons. That was the shipment of that class of coal into the United States last year. I am entitled I think to say that we will certainly lose that trade. I shall not give the figures now because I gave them before, but it means a loss of about \$270,000 a year. It is easy to find the remedy. It would be to put the duty back on again, but the Finance Minister cannot do that without upsetting the whole fabric of his fuel policy. It would affect the situation in Nova Scotia. I do not ask him to change the duty again. The obvious thing to do is to give us a compensating adjustment, as he readily can, to take care of the injury we suffer by the operation of this policy. I am still slow to believe that the Prime Minister, once he understands the matter thoroughly, will refuse to remedy this grievance, especially as he is committed to a policy that demands precisely this action. The increased duty on coal in the east and the increased subsidy with respect to railway transportation call for a compensating adjustment which, as I say, we have not been given. He may help us with the lignite, but that is a small matter; the main thing would be to raise the bonus to \$1 a ton. He has denied that request, but even yet there is a possibility of helping to some extent by giving this bonus of \$1 a ton out of the relief fund. That would be a cheap way of doing it, because it is far better to keep men working steadily at fair wages, even though they work only three

days a week, than to cut them off completely and have to give them a dole. So I say the money could be taken out of the relief grant with great satisfaction and benefit.

Mr. GORDON: How much will the mines get under the present bonus?

Mr. NEILL: They will get about \$25,000 and lose a trade of \$293,000. Of course this aid by way of relief would not be so satisfactory to us as assistance given under the other policy, for this reason: Coal mines are not like corner grocery stores; they must lay their plans for months and years ahead, and if this money were granted out of the relief fund it would be liable to peter out next November, or certainly next March because this act does not operate after that, whereas the policy applied to the eastern and Alberta coal mines runs until 1932, so it would not be nearly so satisfactory. Still, as a drowning man grasps at a straw, certainly it would help us and would relieve the situation there during the coming winter, so I would earnestly implore the Prime Minister to give this request his consideration.

I have only a word more to say, and I am going to quote the Prime Minister. As I said before, he stated that conditions there would almost warrant this money being taken out of the relief fund, and further he said that where adjustments were necessary they would be granted. A day or two ago the right hon. gentleman spoke about the bonus on wheat being a compensating adjustment for the taxes the wheat growers paid through the higher tariff. This is exactly the same situation; I am asking for a compensating adjustment for the loss we have sustained through the increased duty on coal, which cuts us off from a profitable market in the United States. Curiously enough the price of a ton of coal represents twenty bushels of wheat; the bonus on twenty bushels of wheat comes to \$1, and we are asking a bonus of \$1 a ton.

If some measure of this kind is not introduced it cannot be denied that the government has been unfair to the industry and unfair to the district. I think in all moderation I could go further and say they have been untrue to the promises made at election time and to the very pronounced and definite pledges given in their platform. I know there are occasions when prime ministers, governments and sometimes candidates make promises in all good faith which they are unable to carry out because of subsequent circumstances, but that is not so in this case.