

That resolution was adopted by the house. I had seen Canada pictured in the New York papers and other sections of the United States press as Lazarus sitting along the railway lines of the United States trying to beg a lump of coal. That was the reason why I brought in the resolution to make Canada independent of the United States for its coal supply. I wanted to ensure that all the coal we used should be mined and coked under the British flag, in Nova Scotia, in Alberta, in Wales. The government referred that resolution to a select committee of the house of which the chairman was a very fine gentleman, now Mr. Justice W. F. Carroll, of Halifax, and the committee brought in a report recommending a national coal supply. Sir Henry Thornton told me that I was proposing a lunch-counter system of freight rates for Canada. I told him then I did not know whether he had ever dined at a lunch counter, but I told him that it would be far better for us to have such a lunch-counter system and give bonuses, subventions and subsidies than to send \$56,000,000 to Pennsylvania for coal for Canada. Look what happened this winter in our cities and towns and on the farms. You could hardly get a bag of coal delivered. They said that an embargo had been placed on the export of coal from the United States, but we found out that there was no real embargo. What happened that two of our coal controllers went to New York? They were asked by the United States controller if they would object if a suspension was put on the export of coal from the United States to Canada for one month, and they said they had no objection. Parliament was meeting two weeks after that, but parliament was never consulted. The result was that some soldiers' families could not get a bag of coal to keep themselves warm. The system is all wrong, and yet there is no reference to the coal situation in the speech from the throne.

Britain can almost be said to be made of coal. As the great British economist, Ernest Benn, said in a great British publication, the *National Review*, recently:

If any raw material can be the foundation of empire greatness, then our position in the world is or was firmly founded upon coal. The machinery of the industrial revolution, the shipping of our world trade, everything which has gone and still goes to give us our high standard of living, all can be traced back to coal. And now we are in grave difficulties about our very first national asset. The subject is well worth study at the present moment because if coal, as we understand the word, were accurately analysed it would be found to consist of rather more politics than fuel and

by the recollection of what politics has done for coal, we should be able to make an accurate forecast of what politics will do in the matter of our needs for other essential raw materials. . . .

But the planners now at work massing everything together, devising priorities, reducing everything to a speculative statistical basis and arranging for the movement during and immediately after the war of great quantities of wealth from one to the other side of the world, are bold enough to suggest that, the war being over and the aftermath of trouble being abated, then the perfect world can be secured by perpetuating the planning idea. It is at this point that the story of our coal may be useful not only to us, but to the whole of mankind. Planning, which of course is only an alias for socialism, has its roots in the essential but quite natural aversion to the existence of poverty amidst plenty. It proclaims boldly that the well-being of man can be so devised as to provide everything to each according to his needs. It ignores, indeed denies, the natural difficulty expressed in the old proverb, "Necessity is the mother of invention", and bases itself with commendable hope upon the theory that man will work even though with everything provided the need for him to do so is, to put it mildly, relieved of its personal urgency.

The planning of the past remains as a warning, but is a thing of the past, all of it has been concerned with the simple task of robbing Peter to pay Paul: that comparatively easy process has been completed, for Peter has nothing left.

Some of us have spent a lifetime in calling attention to the inevitable end of that sort of planning. It has been proceeding with progressive vigour for two or three generations, but Peter was so wealthy as to obscure its true nature. Two wars have expedited the inevitable end and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the other day that those with incomes of more than £6,000 a year have been reduced to a mere handful of eighty persons, he pronounced the committal sentences or the blessing, whichever way you care to look at it, of the old sort of planning. . . .

An interesting sidelight on the story is provided by Lord Passfield who, as Mr. Sidney Webb, had the indiscretion to publish a book during the kaiser's war entitled "How to Pay for the War", in which he advocated nationalization, planning, and all that kind of thing.

I have previously referred to the house which meets in another place. I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) three or four times if he would give this branch of parliament more war work, but he would not do it. So much for senate reform.

Ten years ago I brought in a resolution which was debated for two days, stating that the most important problem Canada had before it then—and its most important problem even now—is constitutional, parliamentary, cabinet and law reform. There is not one word in the address about that.

Coming to housing and reconstruction: I moved in January, 1935, for a select committee on this subject, and our then leader, Viscount