

mented that the prospects for the latter class are exceedingly slim.

The German Minister of Economics, in the course of the recent debate on the coal situation, told the National Assembly of Germany that the government was ready to import American coal for industrial purposes, and he indicated that it might be necessary this coming fall to discontinue passenger traffic in order to use all available equipment to haul coal and move crops.

Countries Coerced Respecting Coal

It is not necessary to extend our survey into the coal conditions of the smaller European countries. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland and Switzerland, though neutral during the war, found themselves practically dependent upon the warring nations for coal and had to submit to the dictation of terms upon which that necessity would be supplied them. Both Great Britain and Germany released coal to these countries in exchange for food. Germany supplied Holland with coal on condition that food, especially vegetables and meat raised on Dutch soil be sent to Germany; and you may recall that Germany's demand for supplying Switzerland with 200,000 tons of coal per month was gold at the rate of 40,000,000 francs monthly for nine months. Without touching further upon the stressful conditions in these smaller countries, the comments already made, especially respecting coal conditions in Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany, clearly prove the very serious conditions existent in European countries—and this, may I add, at a time when every effort is being made to re-establish mercantile and other conditions on bases approaching what they were prior to the war. Most assuredly this means keen competition for any available coal, and in this respect the governments and peoples of Europe are looking for a maximum of relief through coal shipments from the United States.

United States' export coal is a phase of the world coal problem in which Canada is deeply interested, because she yearly imports from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons of coal—anthracite and bituminous—from the States.

Embargoes May be Necessary

Now, in the statement I am about to make I wish to emphasize that it is in no sense my intention to suggest that it is, or that it would become, the arbitrary desire of the United States to deprive Canada of the coal which at present is so necessary to life in this country. Of course with their co-operation, we have in a measure become dependent upon their coal fields, and it will be expected that the States, in all fairness, will facilitate any necessary future readjustment connected with Canada's fuel supply. It is important, however, to take cognizance of the fact that a nation, pressed by the demands of its own people, may be compelled, under certain conditions, to deprive other nations—in part at least—of even the necessities of life until the needs of its own citizens are met. No country can be expected to send out of its own confines that which is essential to the very existence of its own people. Personally, I do not believe that the United States, or any other country with a large outlook on present world affairs, will allow whole nations, especially those with whom they have been allied, to suffer direct distress with respect to fuel without seeking to alleviate it to the greatest possible extent.

When communities in Canada and the States during previous coal shortages have been in need of coal, certain communities adjacent to other sources of supply, such as wood, softer grades of coal, etc., were compelled to use these in order that the supplies elsewhere available could be distributed to those in greatest need. Correspondingly, it would not be surprising if a country like Canada, with vast fuel resources, were directed to speed up its utilization of its own fuel, and would not be left undisturbed, so to speak, in its enjoyment of burning what is now one of the luxuries of the world, namely anthracite from the coal fields of Pennsylvania.

Let us next note what in general are the conditions in the great republic across our borders. Coal production in

the United States has dropped substantially behind what it was during the war years. If the present rate of production of bituminous coal is maintained for the remaining twenty-one weeks of the coal year, the production will about equal the output of 1913. The production of anthracite is increasing over what it was a few weeks ago, but it is still short of the demand. The coal stocks of the United States have been depleted. There is great demand for transportation. Car shortage will accentuate itself with the demand for cars to move the grain crop. The exit of miners back to Europe, serious strikes, and other factors, have contributed to curtail coal production and distribution in that country. If more serious strikes should occur in the States, it will tend to make the supplying of coal to other countries, including Canada, still more precarious. Canada cannot afford to overlook how her own interests may at any time become involved by serious coal strikes in the United States. These strikes are an ever-present menace. Speaking in the United States Senate on August 8th, Senator King, of Utah, stated that he had heard "that there was a program to organize a great strike now, to tie up the transportation system and take over the railroads, then next winter, when the people were shivering for want of coal, organize another strike in the mines, cut off the country's fuel supply, and take over the mines." The senator expressed the hope—and which we all share—that government authority will be able to prevent such extremes being reached. I simply quote the senator's statement as indicating possibilities which he thought of sufficient importance to bring formally to the attention of his colleagues. It is clear, therefore, that coal production in the States must necessarily fall short of meeting even the most pressing demands.

Common Aims and Sympathies

Canada is indeed exceedingly fortunate in being neighbor to a country whose national aims and sympathies are so akin to its own. During the war both countries have manifested special interchange of courtesies. In the past coal shortage, for example, the Fuel Controller, Dr. H. A. Garfield, announced that recognition of Canada's needs for coal would be on the same basis as though she were one of the states of the Union. Our own Fuel Controller, C. A. Magrath, rendered signal service to both countries. I like to recall the sentiment manifested by our neighbors when great distress has arisen due to necessity corresponding to that begotten of the Halifax catastrophe—and such sentiment has been reciprocated by Canadians when conditions have been reversed. The governor of Massachusetts telegraphed assuringly, "The people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are ready to answer any call that may be made upon us. Massachusetts stands ready to go the limit in rendering every assistance you may be in need of." The Governor of Maine telegraphed, "Any help Maine can give is yours," while many others sent corresponding messages. These sentiments cannot better be summed up than in the inspiring message sent by President Wilson to

"His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada:

"In presence of the awful disaster at Halifax the people of the United States offer to their noble brethren of the Dominion their heart-felt sympathy and grief, as is fitting at this time, when to the ties of kinship and community of speech and of material interests are added the strong bonds of union in the common cause of devotion to the supreme duties of national existence."

Canada Must Bestir Herself

Obviously, so long as such sentiments govern men's actions, the people living on this continent cannot be deprived of that which is essential to their existence. Nevertheless, with the growing scarcity of coal, the United States, no matter what her good will or desire towards Canada may be, may not be able to cope with her own and with the prevailing world need. There is no doubt that in the spirit and disposition manifested in the statements just quoted our neighbor will see that Canada is fairly dealt with. We should not, however, trespass unduly upon friendly accommodation.