

asking for, being given by way of a relief measure. Further, speaking directly to me, he informed me that his policy was a national policy and that wherever it was necessary compensating adjustments would be made. I tell him that here and now is the hour and the moment at which the compensating adjustments should be made, and this is the place in which to make them. They are obviously due now.

There was another feature in connection with this matter in respect to which I think a mistake arose in the Prime Minister's mind. It was in connection with lignite. At one place he said that in his opinion the lignite to which I had referred, coming into British Columbia from the state of Washington, was not true lignite, and therefore the matter was at an end.

Mr. GORDON: You mean from Bellingham?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, and from Newcastle in the state of Washington. He said that it was not lignite. In a sense that is true, but unfortunately it comes in as lignite. You cannot tell the difference between lignite and bituminous coal by looking at it. You must have some rule of thumb or scientific method of finding out the moisture content. I agree with the Minister of Mines that it is not lignite, but bituminous coal, but it is coming in and will continue to come in as lignite.

Mr. GORDON: What is the difference between bituminous coal and lignite?

Mr. NEILL: The difference is in the moisture content.

Mr. GORDON: How much difference is there between the two?

Mr. NEILL: It may be half of one per cent. When it was necessary to make a dividing line between lignite and bituminous coal—

Mr. BENNETT: It is six per cent or over.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, if it is six per cent moisture content or over it is classified as lignite, and if it is a fraction under six per cent it is classified as bituminous coal. That is the point I want to make. It is not the coal that is wrong; it is the definition. It is no use saying that that is not lignite because it is, so long as it comes in under the definition of lignite. What is needed to be changed is the definition, which was wrongly or carelessly made a number of years ago. I have the records here. I allude to one which the minister can check up. There was a special committee in 1926 investigating the coal resources of Canada, and on June 9, at page

[Mr. Neill.]

179 will be found a reference to lignite and a description of the difference between it and bituminous coal. Dr. Camsell, the Deputy Minister of Mines, was giving evidence. I tried to pin him down. I asked him what was lignite, and he said that it was coal containing about ten per cent moisture. The definition says only six per cent, but I say that it was carelessly drawn at the time. Then I have statements from Mr. McLeish, who is one of the officials of the minister's department, and he says that it is quite possible, as the scientific classifications of coal are not sharply defined, that parliament if it so desired—the department itself could do it—could quite justifiably adopt seven per cent as the limiting point for lignite coal. The British Columbia chamber of commerce suggests eight per cent.

Mr. GORDON: What effect would that have on the movement of coal so far as we are concerned?

Mr. NEILL: As regards coal going from Alberta to the United States?

Mr. GORDON: Any place.

Mr. NEILL: If it was judiciously done it would keep their coal out and allow our coal to go into the United States.

Mr. GORDON: What does the hon. member mean by "judiciously done"?

Mr. NEILL: Not making it either ridiculously high or ridiculously low, as it is at present. If it were put at eight per cent it would probably exclude Bellingham coal. I have the records here of the coal coming in from the United States and the moisture content runs from 6.1, 6.2 and so forth. The definition could be changed to exclude Bellingham coal from Canada and allow southern Alberta coal to go into the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. NEILL: No, it is not carried, and I consider it a piece of gratuitous impertinence, Mr. Chairman, for you to say so when a member is on his feet and speaking.

Unless the definition is changed this coal must come in as lignite. If the definition were changed it would help us materially. It would then come in as bituminous and carry a duty of 75 cents per ton. That would give us that trade, which amounted last year to 17,000 tons, not a very big amount, but still quite an item.

The other matter about which I think the minister was inadvertently mistaken was this. He stated that doing away with this lignite