

*Thompson*

Mr. Wallace's Bill was criticised on the ground that it really enacted nothing. It was merely declaratory, in so far as it had any effect, in fact it merely curtailed the punishment from 7 to 2 years. It was admitted by Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, answering David Mills that this was so, but it was argued that the publicity given to the law and the offence would have a restraining effect. It was further argued that penalties or punishment sometimes defeated the ends of justice. (Get quotation.)

Mr. Wallace laid stress on what had been accomplished by the committee of investigation appointed by the House, shewed wherein certain combinations had been ended by the enquiry, and wherein public opinion was brought to bear on others, notably the coal dealers of Ottawa.

(Take in example)

Mr. Sproule emphasized the importance of publicity as a deterring factor. That he was right in this, and as shewing that publicity is more effective than penalty would appear from the fact that certain combines were broken up through the investigation before the House of Commons Committee, also experience under the Criminal Code has shown that the making of restraint of trade a criminal offence, has defeated the end desired, the measure has been a failure from the point of view of obtaining that publicity on which alone its own effectiveness depends, and in which alone lies the really deterrent power.