

While 'combines' are protected, the National Policy is in danger. There is another danger to be feared from these gigantic trade monopolies: they constitute a menace to our political freedom."

I would particularly commend that to the attention of the hon. gentleman opposite,—

"They can afford to make liberal contributions to campaign funds out of their enormous profits, in return for the protection afforded them by law."

That is not in the United States, Sir, it is in Canada,—

"In the interests of political morality as well as in the interests of the Canadian consumer, the 'combines' must go."

Now, Sir, I have no doubt that the hon. mover of this motion does not desire to shut out from his committee enquiry into combines which we are told exist among manufacturers, and I dare say the hon. gentleman will accept an amendment which I offer to his resolution, in order to make the investigation include such combines. I also think that the object which he has in moving his resolution, and which I am sure the whole House will have in supporting it, would be promoted by his adding a provision that the committee, in addition to examining into the subject, should suggest to the House what, if any, changes in the law seem to be necessary in the public interest. I am sure he cannot want this committee simply to be an examining committee without any authority or direction from the House to make practical suggestions. In the States they call such committees "smelling committees," and I am sure he does not want this to be a committee simply to smell out grievances and leave them there, but he wants it to suggest some remedy. I have a strong conviction myself that the only real remedy for combines which are protected by a high tariff, is to reduce the duty. But there may be some combines which are not affected by the tariff and which would require some other remedies, and I have no doubt we would all be glad to know what they are. Therefore, in order to include manufacturing combines, I move:

That the said resolution be amended by adding after the word "sale" in the third line thereof, the words, "or manufacture and sale."

Mr. GUILLET. Having seen this resolution before it was moved, and having had some conversation with the mover of it, I am sure he fully intended that the enquiry should cover all combinations, whether those of manufacturers or others, and, therefore, I presume there will be no objection on his part to the amendment. The hon. member who has spoken last might have spared us the ebullition of feeling which, on every occasion on which the question of the National Policy arises, is displayed by the other side of the House. But I suppose we ought not to complain that those gentlemen feel so sore about the National Policy. A little boy once said to his mother: "Mother, I wish you would make sister stop crying every time I strike her with a club." It would be equally unreasonable for us to complain of those gentlemen becoming indignant every time they feel that club. It is well known that the advocates of the National Policy in this House and in the country intended not only that it should stimulate manufactures, but also that it should promote competition in the country; and the patriotic object of this resolution is to see that any attempt which may be made to destroy competition should be prevented. I do not think the people would be willing to see the National Policy wiped out. There are evils incident to every progressive movement and to every reform, as has been well shown by writers on progressive government and political economy, and it is necessary to watch these evils. It is necessary that the friends of the National Policy should discover what those incidental evils are, in order to see that the people of Canada shall not lose the great blessings that have been brought to them by that policy. I say we would be no better off if we removed protection and exposed ourselves to greater combinations which we could not

get rid of, whereas now we have only to deal with combinations which we can get rid of. What was said in a report to the British House of Commons? The laboring classes are very little aware of the extent to which they are often indebted for being employed at all, to the capitalists, and of the immense losses which their employers voluntarily incur in order to destroy foreign competition and keep possession of foreign markets. Instances are well known of employers having carried on their works at a loss of £300,000 or £400,000 in order to meet and crush foreign competition. These large capitalists are the great instruments of warfare against competing capitalists in foreign countries. "It is the duty of English manufacturers," says Lord Brougham, "to crush foreign industries in their cradle." To such influences as these would our infant industries be exposed were it not for protection, and were protection removed ruin would soon overtake them. There are other ways of curing the evils, which are of lesser moment as compared with the blessings that have flowed from the National Policy, than by destroying that policy itself. The people, though in some cases unjustly alarmed by exaggerated reports, are not opposed to the National Policy. All they require is that where evils exist, they should be remedied by the strong hand of the law. Modern writers have admitted that the most advanced civilisations are subject to these evils, and that by legislation we must prevent combinations and conspiracies against the individual freedom of the trader. The enquiry we propose to make is not in the interests of the manufacturer, but in the interests of the people, and I trust the Government will grant this committee. I am sure it will result in good; I am sure the result of its deliberations will be to check the evils that may have arisen, if they are such as they have been represented to be, but we know that grave exaggerations and misrepresentations have been made on this subject. I do not think the evils are as extensive as they are represented to be, but, such as they are, this committee will discover them and apply the remedy. Even in the days of free trade, even in that period which is called by comparison the free trade period of Canada, there were rings. There were coal oil rings, and salt rings, and other rings under the administration of the gentlemen opposite, so that these evils cannot be attributed to a protective tariff. In those days of free trade, rings existed which raised the prices of necessaries of life, and yet they were not taken hold of and suppressed by the Government then in power. I will not take up the time of the House by any further remarks in seconding this resolution. It would only prejudice the case to enter into any attack on these combinations, before they have any opportunity of representing their side of the question. They may show that they are not guilty of the charges so recklessly made; and I trust that when the enquiry is made, we will be able to show, by most satisfactory evidence to the House, that we have put the merits of this question on a footing that will enable the House to deal with it in an intelligent manner.

Mr. LISTER. The motion made by the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution is a timely motion indeed, but I would say to him what has been often said before of men who seek to occupy antagonistic positions, that he cannot chew meal and whistle at the same time. He cannot condemn the combine and at the same time attempt to sustain the so-called National Policy or high tariff policy of this Administration. So far as the combines are concerned or the trusts, they are the natural and inevitable outcome of a high protective tariff, but before I enter into the question at any great length, I desire to say to the hon. gentleman and the Government, that it is ungenerous and ungrateful on their part to make this attack upon the manufacturers of the country. Does not the hon. gentle-