

The Government appealed to the people in 1878 on that policy and the people sustained them under that policy. But soon afterwards these refiners, and the Grocers Guild, as it is called, entered into a combination to raise the price of sugar. The people find fault with the refiners, that with the protection they already have they should have entered into this unholy alliance. They were not satisfied with the protection they had under the National Policy. They were getting rich, but they wanted to squeeze a little more out of the people. That is proved by the sworn testimony taken before the Committee on Combines in the House of Commons. The representatives of the people in the other House passed a Bill, and they sent it up to the Canadian Lords, many of whom I think (I am not sure) are in combination against the people. When I hear words passing between the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia and the hon. gentleman from Toronto about smashing the Confederation I do not think any hon. member of this Chamber would do anything to smash the Confederation; but I say this to the sugar lords, the coal lords, the coffin lords, Lord Codfish, Lord Pickle Herring and the cold water lord, and all the other lords in this House who are forming combinations against the people of this country, that the people who gave them that protection can take it away from them. The people are their masters. We are here, but by what right? We stand here with walls of stone around us. Independent of the people? No. Here is a Bill sent in from the House of Commons last year, and again this year, and we say we will not adopt it. You have got to give way in the end. You are only carrying this nefarious combination principle too far. It is a warning, gentlemen! Submit to it gracefully. That is my advice. There are combinations, of course. For what? For the benefit of the consumers in this country? No; combinations of the rich, in order that they may put more money in their own pockets. Do you imagine for one moment that the people in this country are going to stand it? When they adopted the National Policy it was to give manufacturers an opportunity to make a fair profit; but the moment you combine against the people they will kick. They will not stand it. This Bill was referred to the Committee on

Banking and Commerce and to accommodate some senators it was fixed for discussion on Wednesday, and before the deputation of farmers came down some gentlemen wanted to choke them off. We have taken two days in committee on this Bill, and we have taken this afternoon, discussing and explaining to the lay mind, as these professional or legal lords I see around me who aspire to the ermine by-and-bye would say the meaning of the words "unduly" and "unreasonably." I do not know that I understand it yet, but it strikes me in this way, that these combines can take just so much from the people, but if they go further than that they will be punished. It is as much as to say we can rob you of a certain amount, but until we go so far you cannot interfere with us. That is the truth of it, because I have taken a little trouble to look up the meaning of the words "unduly" and "unreasonably." Just think of the Senate being two or three days discussing these two little words? How anxious gentlemen engaged in combines are to come here and protect themselves. The National Policy protects them on all sides, but they don't want to give the gentleman who promoted this Bill in the other House the slightest chance. I may say that the promoter was insulted before the committee, or the next thing to it; he could hardly get a hearing. As usual, Alexander Coppersmith was raising an uproar at Ephesus because his trade was likely to be interfered with. "Great is Diana! Great is Diana, the God of the Ephesians."

I have taken some trouble to look up the meaning of the words, "unduly" and "unreasonably," and I find it as follows:—

*Undue influence* is an influence which restrains free and deliberate judgment on any matter.—Sweet's Law Dictionary.

*Undue influence at an election* is an influence which restrains the free exercise of a voter's franchise by violence, or intimidation, or any other improper manner.—Sweet's Law Dictionary.

*Undue influence* of any kind has been decided to mean influence that savours of fraud.—Anderson's Law Dictionary, p. 542.

"There is no difficulty in deciding what is meant by *unduly* in the Act. The word does not in any way lessen the force of the Act against combines.

"The word 'unreasonably' in the Act of 1889, is calculated to invite litigation and confuse the decisions of the courts.

"Prices rise and fall to such an extent year by year, that a 'reasonable' price one year might be an extravagant price another year; and a combination to raise a very low price might be held to be 'reasonable,' while a combination to raise a good price might be held to be equally 'reasonable.'