

in this Bill. I move that "Western" be struck out and "North-West" be substituted.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. DICKEY—This Bill should not pass from the committee without a word being said as to the proceedings in this House upon it. We have already made some eight or nine amendments in this Bill—a Bill which peculiarly affects the other House, and which we had every reason to suppose would come to us in such a form that, except in some vital matter, we should not require to make any amendments at all. I mention this in confirmation of the ground which was taken the other day in another debate in reference to the labor and the pains and attention bestowed upon Bills in this House which come from the other Chamber, and the remark is perhaps excusable on the present occasion, because we are dealing with a Bill which belongs almost exclusively—at all events, to a large extent—to the other Chamber, and particularly affects them. I think it is a very strong confirmation of the ground which was taken on a former occasion, and redounds greatly to the credit of this House.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE, from the committee, reported the Bill with amendments, which were concurred in.

The Bill was then read the third time, as amended, and passed.

THE COMBINES BILL.

REJECTED.

The Order of the Day being called,—

"Consideration of the report of the Select Committee on Banking and Commerce on (Bill 77) 'An Act to amend the Act for the prevention and Suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade.'"

HON. MR. VIDAL—The report which I am about to ask the concurrence of the House is in the following words:—

"The Select Committee on Banking and Commerce, to whom was referred the Bill from the House of Commons intituled: 'An Act to amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade,' have, in obedience to the order of reference of Monday, the twenty-eighth

of April last, examined the said Bill, and now beg leave to report thereon, as follows:—

"Your committee have carefully examined and considered the said Bill, and have heard, from parties interested for and against the Bill, representations as to the purpose and effect thereof. It has not, in the opinion of your committee, been proved that any difficulty exists in enforcing the provisions of the existing law, nor that any injustice has resulted, or is likely to result, from the operation of those sections of the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 41, which are sought to be amended by the Bill."

In order to give some explanation of the action of the committee it may be necessary that I should remind the House that the Act which is proposed to be amended by the one which has been under consideration by the committee was passed last year. It came from the House of Commons to this Chamber, and in this Chamber the words which are now sought to be removed by the proposed legislation were inserted after very careful and lengthy deliberation—the words "unduly and unreasonably." In the ordinary mode of proceeding with measures of this nature, it is customary to refer such a Bill to a Committee of the Whole House, being a public measure, but the House showing its desire to afford every opportunity to parties interested in the Bill to state their case, sent it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where ample opportunity was afforded to the advocates of the Bill and those who were opposed to it to present their views for or against its adoption. A large number of persons availed themselves of the opportunity, and the matter was very thoroughly discussed before the committee at its two sittings. In this way the House has shown its earnest desire to meet any reasonable views that might be presented to guide it in legislation of this character. It has not stood upon its dignity and said: "Last year we put into the Bill words that we deemed necessary, and we see no reason why we should change it." No statement, much less proof, was made in the committee of any evil result having followed upon the introduction of these words. It was not shewn to the committee that in any single case they had rendered the law inoperative or in any way thwarted its effect on the evils which the Legislature desired it to remove. It is quite true that in urging their case the advocates of the Bill stated that certain legal gentlemen had said it was no use to take