

deviating a little from what was the exact statement.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Co-operation is one of the things which gentlemen who are a little younger than I am may perhaps hear a good deal more of in the course of their lives, for it seems to me likely to be one of the coming questions of the day and having a larger meaning than is applied to it now. When the principle of co-operation comes to be more generally applied to our dealings with each other and with foreigners we shall then begin to see the importance of it. Before I resume my seat I should like to refer for a moment to the question of sugar. I did not happen to be in the Committee on Banking and Commerce the morning that the witnesses were examined in 1888, when Mr. J. A. Matthewson was sworn and was asked the question :

“Q. You know that this arrangement still exists? A. I know it exists, and it existed in 1886, when I refused to submit to the combination—this conspiracy, is hardly the term for it. I see there is a strong idea abroad that the refiners were not associated with this thing. The thing would not have lasted one hour if the refiners had had nothing to do with it.”

“Our prices have been raised ever since the combination started, and it is to the advantage of the refiners, and they have lowered the quality of the yellow refined sugar; the quality never was lower than it has been or was till the end of the year. We never had such a poor quality of sugar, and the retail grocers throughout the country will confirm the statement; we never had such an extremely objectionable quality, and sticky.”

I do not insist upon these statements with regard to sugar refiners. I think we have elicited from the hon. gentlemen opposite that if the combines exist at all they exist in a form much more modified and much less injurious than was generally believed; but that the sugar trade is conducted upon a reasonable and fair basis I cannot think is the case, judging from the fact that sometimes sugar has been exceedingly low in the old country, and but for the National Policy and the sugar factories of Canada consumers in this Dominion might have reaped all the advantages of it. They find in this purchase of cheap sugar that they are generally paying about double the price at which sugar is sold in Europe. I know quite well that I will be told that the sugar business in Europe has been abnormal for years past, in consequence of some foreign countries, especially Germany and France, giving what is practically

a bounty upon home-manufactured sugar. I do not believe that they actually pay out the money to the manufacturers of refined sugar extracted from the beet root, but they manage their business something in this way: Beets are received in the factory and weighed by a Government inspector, and a duty is charged upon that per 100 pounds, which is refunded on proof of the export of the manufactured article—another way of giving so much per 100 pounds of a bounty. Any quantity of sugar which the manufacturer can extract from that given quantity of beet root upon which duty has been paid in excess of the duty is supposed to be his profit, and that is the system which has so broken down the English refiners. I have spoken on this subject with more than usual interest, particularly because I am myself a native of a city which at one time was one of the first sugar refining depots in Great Britain. The sugar refiners there were owners of estates in the West Indies, owners of fine oak-built ships, in which they brought their sugars home, and sent their supplies abroad, and owners of the refineries in which the sugars were treated. Under the old régime refiners grew rich. But all these things have changed now, and the old merchants and plantation slave owners have given place to another generation, and that generation are scientific men, who learned new arts in sugar refining. They made fortunes, but they were afterwards broken in their business, and their fortunes in a great many instances disappeared by the introduction of bounty-fed German and French sugars. These are details which perhaps are not relevant to this debate, but I must say, returning to the words which are considered so objectionable in this committee, that I have no scruples whatever in eliminating them from the Act. They come here unsupported by any interest from the other end of the building, and I think that the Senate is as free as free can be to use its own discretion whether they will continue them in the Bill or not. Remember that they were placed there tentatively. It was a mere experiment. They are not words which are generally found in Acts of Parliament. They are unpractical words, and ill-suited to the object for which they were adopted, and we should eliminate them or substitute others.