

indolence and stagnation. There is also the weakening of the moral fibre that always occurs when an individual or an industry is led to trust to the protection of a tariff, aided by a combination formed under cover of that tariff, for a business security which ought to be attained by skill, enterprise and industry.

So far as the consumer is concerned, the effect of what has been going on is painfully apparent. Canada is becoming in many respects, one of the dearest countries in the world in which to live. Ready-made clothing costs more than made-to-order suits would cost if the tariff on British woollens and cottons did not stand in the way of importation. For enamelled-ware fully twice as much is demanded here as in Germany. Canadian users of boots, shoes and rubbers have to pay prices just about equal to the duty in excess of those which American users of the same articles are charged.

In the United States, which is also under a protective tariff, an effort has been made to organize combinations in different lines of industry, but that effort has not been so successful as with us. The country is bigger, and there are more factories in a single line. That is one reason why the work of the trust organizer has not been an easy one across the line. Moreover American law makers and law enforcers have discouraged this pernicious form of activity. Some time ago a combination was formed for the purpose of controlling the business of manufacturing wall paper in the United States. Each company in the combination was left to operate its own business and make its own sales, but a joint committee fixed prices and limited output. One of the companies in

the combine recently found it necessary to sue a jobber for \$50,000 worth of wall paper supplied. The jobber set up the plea that the company, being part of a combination in restraint of trade, and as such acting in violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust law, could not invoke the law for the protection of its interests. The contention of the jobber was last month sustained by the United States Supreme Court. The Court's decision declared, in effect, that the company which sued, being part of an illegal organization, was an outlaw and therefore could not use the law for the enforcement of its contracts, or the collection of its debts. No wonder, with such a law in existence, and enforced in this way, that the trust evil does not flourish so fully in the United States as it does in Canada.

We have plenty of law in this country, too, but it is not enforced. The Criminal Code provides penalties for the maintenance of organizations such as everybody knows to exist, but it is allowed to remain almost a dead letter. Some prosecutions begun under it have been abandoned. One, commenced some three years ago, is, at this writing, still dragging its weary length through the courts.

The law is supposed to provide an other means of relief. Authority is given the Dominion Government in all cases in which a combine is shown to have been formed for the purpose of preventing domestic competition, to abolish or reduce the duty on imports which would compete with the home combination. Evidence has been piled up by the Toronto Star which shows that home combinations have been formed, that competition has been eliminated, but still the Dominion Government makes no move looking to re