

individual. I think I remember the Minister of Justice in the present Government stating that an Englishman's house was his castle, and that he, the Minister, was going to see to it that section 98 was repealed. Mind you, I am not discussing the merit of his argument. I agreed with him to the extent of voting for the repeal of section 98; and now, after the electors of the country have given the Government a mandate to come to Parliament and have that section of the Criminal Code repealed on the ground that it is an invasion of the rights of the home and of the man, we are being asked under the Combines Investigation Act to adopt the same principle.

The Acts which my honourable friend quoted a few moments ago are different from the Combines Investigation Act. They are not criminal legislation, but this Act is; and it contains the definition of a crime. This Act is organized for the purpose of detecting crime and punishing the criminal, and in that lies the difference.

In any event, we were being asked in this Bill, a Bill respecting criminal law, to adopt the same principle that was contained in section 98, and because we are lawyers we have no right, according to the honourable gentleman from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock), to have an opinion, to have a conscience, or to undertake to get up in a committee of this House to say that while we are not opposed to the principle of the Combines Investigation Act, there are certain features we should like to see amended. I am not going to attempt to say what are the motives of the honourable member from Parkdale. I do not know. As a matter of fact, I am rather puzzled and perplexed by the speech he made. When he stood up and tried to give the impression that the lawyers on the committee and the member for Ottawa East (Hon. Mr. Côté) were against the Combines Investigation Act and in favour of one law for the poor and another for the rich, he was doing something he had no right to do, and which was neither fair nor based on fact.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: The honourable senator missed the gist of my contention. It was that he and his friends—particularly his friends—had planned that the Act would be no good, and for six years had made sure that it would be no good.

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVE (Translation): Honourable senators, I may be permitted to use my mother tongue to say how much the spectacular outbursts of the honourable senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) astonish me every time he addresses this

Hon. Mr. COTE.

House. To hear the honourable senator speak, in quivering tones, one might think the members on this side of the House were friends and protectors of trusts, and the members on the other side their enemies. That is not just, true or intelligent.

I was ready to support the Bill with the amendment which had been accepted by both parties, as it was reported to this House by the right honourable leader of the Left.

If there is a man who has fought the trusts and suffered politically thereby, it is your humble servant. I have fought them with all the energy I could command. I fought them in the Legislature of my province, where I saw their intentions and their nefarious work. The results of their audacity and rapacity are evident. Trusts are one of the main causes of our social disorders. It is not enough to denounce them; they must be destroyed, or controlled by effective laws.

The people are complaining of the abuses to which they are subjected. They grumble and threaten. They feel strongly against the trusts, to which they ascribe their ills.

There is a tendency to confuse capital, which is essential to private enterprise, with capitalism, the great social enemy, the centralizer and monopolizer of production and sale.

I am in favour of such legislation as will provide the most efficient protection against the abuses of monopoly. Such a law is necessary. But abuses should not be combated by other abuses. Such is the point of the last dispute, and I regret that the Minister who sponsored the Bill should have withdrawn his word, of which an honest interpretation was previously given by the honourable leader of the Government.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable senators, having heard the right honourable gentleman's (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen's) assertion that the Committee on Banking and Commerce had concluded its labours on Bill 41 on understanding from what I had said that the Minister of Labour, while dissenting from the principle embodied in my right honourable friend's amendment, would reluctantly accept it, I would ask that in accordance with our practice the chairman reporting the Bill do now move concurrence in the report. I shall then move the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: Honourable senators. I move concurrence in the amendments to Bill 41.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Is it your pleasure, honourable members, to adopt the motion?