

He thought that very conclusive and very convincing. It may be to those who are superficial enough to be led by the old *post hoc propter hoc* style of argument; but to the thinking business people of this country, arguments of that kind will not carry the weight which the hon. gentleman seems to imagine. The real question with respect to coal, as with respect to every other article, is this: is it or is it not to-day dearer because of the imposition of these additional taxes? If, by reason of the additional taxation, prices have been increased 5, 10 or 20 per cent. to that extent, is the National Policy a burden and grievance to the people? The hon. the Minister of Railways spoke about the price of coal in Chicago, and told us that railway competition reduces the cost of freight and sometimes even prices at the place of purchase, at the same time pointing out that there are competing points to which freight comes at lower rates than are charged for shorter distances. That is, no doubt, the fact, but competition between water and rail routes existed before the National Policy came into force. Probably there have been some developments in American railways, which have tended to cheapen coal at particular points; but competition has not been increased in the slightest degree by reason of the adoption of the National Policy by the people of Canada. The hon. the Minister of Railways has mentioned that the people of Chicago have to pay very much higher for their coal than those of Boston, because, he says, there is some competition in Boston and none in Chicago. The only competition at Boston is the little that comes from Nova Scotia, and perhaps a few cargoes come from England, but I do not understand that coal is received there in sufficiently large quantities to compete with the coal from American mines. The competition to-day is less than it was a few years ago when coal was admitted duty free. No doubt, in the present state of things in the United States, if a higher protective duty on coal were asked, Congress would be willing to grant it; they got all the protection they chose to ask in the past. The hon. Minister has compared the prices at Chicago with those on this side of the line, and has declared that prices have changed since the National Policy was introduced, not merely to an extent equal to the 50 cents duty, but to a very much larger extent. The operation of the National Policy, if we are to accept the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, are of the most extraordinary character, not merely mysterious and miraculous, but actually taking the place of Providence itself. Providence, according to those hon. gentlemen, is now but a minor influence in the affairs of the world. Indeed, since the great National Policy has come into force, there is no longer, if we may believe them, a Providential controlling power over nations, producing abundant harvests in some countries when the harvests in others are deficient, and making peoples feel they are dependent on each other. Providence is now a minor power, and the National Policy of Canada is that which regulates the state of the crops in the Dominion, the United States and Europe, and regulates the commerce of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone so far as to claim that every commercial change which happens to prove advantageous to the Canadian people is the result, not of the action and control of an over-ruling Providence, but of the National Policy of which they boast so much. The hon. Minister of Railways spoke afterwards of the prices of coal at Prescott and Ogdensburg. If I apprehend correctly his remarks, they are to this effect: To bring coal from Ogdensburg to Prescott costs 67½ cents per ton for freight, and more for port and other charges; but the price at Prescott is much less than the price at Ogdensburg, with the duty, the freight and other charges added. It is well known, however, that it costs less to bring coal to Prescott and land it there in the first instance than to take it to Ogdensburg.

Mr. ANGLIN.

In that way the hon. gentleman and those who have labored for him have endeavored to make a case in his behalf. Those assertions are so wide of the mark that they must have seemed absurd to hon. gentlemen opposite, although they were ready to cheer the hon. gentleman. They watched every opportunity to encourage their leader; no strong assertion was allowed to pass without its cheer, nothing that could be called a *bon mot* passed without a redoubled cheer. There was some little joke passed which we on this side of the House could scarcely understand, over which hon. gentlemen opposite went into ecstasies; but while the hon. Minister was reading his long, elaborate calculations to prove that the Americans paid the duty on coal imported into Canada, his followers were silent. The calculations did not go down. They knew too well that these statements were not only incredible, but that the people would not be misled by them, that the Minister in making that statement was damaging their case before the intelligent constituencies of the Dominion, and they were silent because they were apprehensive. Glances were exchanged which indicated to us that they would very much prefer that the hon. Minister had not dwelt so long on that subject, and had not gone so far as he did. While the hon. Minister was talking an hon. member was prompted to send a telegram to ascertain the prices of coal at Detroit and Windsor, which are a mile apart. I did not think that it was necessary to send such a telegram. When I saw statements similar to those read by the Minister appear in some of the newspapers of the Tory party, I confess I was perfectly astounded to find that any person could write any such articles and hope they would be received with favor by any portion of the people. They were so palpably absurd, so utterly unwarrantable, and so intensely ridiculous, that I never could imagine that the man who wrote them really believed they would be accepted by any large number of people. Perhaps they thought they could calculate largely on the credulity of the people, and indeed they showed this, day after day, by the manner in which they dealt with this question. Therefore, I was not surprised to find hon. gentlemen opposite stunned by the course taken by the hon. Minister of Railways, nor was I much surprised to find the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who often owed his success to the audacity of his assertions, take such a course. It seemed infatuation, it is true. It seemed to be one of those cases which prompted an ancient writer to say that, "whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad." Some demon must have taken away from the hon. gentleman that acuteness of intellect, that power of vision, that capacity for understanding how far he can traffic on the credulity of his audience, not in this House alone, but throughout the country, when he ventured on such statements as those. They will be published broadcast throughout the country, and I hope every business man will get a copy, so that he may be able to judge of the character of the statements, on which hon. gentlemen opposite rely as a means to carry the elections, about which they have begun to talk so much lately. Here is a statement of prices in Detroit and Windsor, telegraphed while the Minister was speaking, by a gentleman whose authority is undoubted. The difference in price between Windsor and Detroit is 75 cents. At Windsor coal sells at \$7.50, which, in Detroit, can be bought at from \$6.50 to \$6.75. Twenty-five cents, I presume, will bring it across the river and the duty is fifty cents. But I am told that a vessel could as easily turn into the harbor of Windsor as Detroit, so that in that case the carriage would add nothing to the cost.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman name his authority.

Mr. ANGLIN. He is Mr. A. A. Bartlett.

Mr. MILLS. Perfectly reliable.

Mr. BOWELL. Is he Police Magistrate at Windsor?