

should remain as it is now on the Statute-book.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Under the very particular circumstances in which this Bill has come before us, on this occasion, considering that it has come from the House of Commons with a unanimous vote asking this House to review its decision of last year, I certainly feel that it is incumbent on me to make some few observations on it. I am not one of those who think that the Senate is bound to concur in all the demands of the other House. It is one of our reasons for being here that we should stand in the gap, when a proper occasion occurs, and afford time to the community to study a doubtful measure before we give our final decision upon it. As to these two words about which so much has been said, I consider that last Session, when they found their way into the Act, we allowed them a place there as a kind of experiment. We were not sanguine as to the result. Many of us were doubtful as to their fitness, and it was simply an experiment to see whether the views of all parties could not be met by their introduction. It seems to me that both of these words are ill suited to the position they are paced in. The hon. gentleman from Montreal, in his address, stated that he had found them in various Acts of Parliament. I do not doubt the correctness of his statement. I recollect myself where the word "reasonable" is found in connection with the word "intendment," but I think "unduly" is an unparliamentary word. I do not feel that I should be at all acting inconsistently in refusing my consent to the continuance of these words in this Act for which I voted last year, nor do I consider that the bond of which the hon. gentleman spoke is at all binding on this House. He speaks of the Senate being bound by the fact that we placed these two words in the Act last year, and that we are bound therefore to continue them there.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—I do not think I said that.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Of course, if the hon. gentleman disclaims it I will not press it, though I took his words down as they fell. I think the hon. gentleman spoke of the Senate as being bound; however, let that pass. I would not consider

any such thing binding on me. If the words are not properly there, either amend them or remove them altogether. As to the arguments brought forward in their favor, I wish to make a few remarks. I listened with great pleasure to the address of my hon. friend from Quinté division. There was no want of precision about his remarks. What he said did not bear a double meaning by any means, and I think it was a very useful and very suitable address to meet the occasion; but I did expect before this debate closed, and before many of the gentlemen who are supposed to have an interest in manufacturing sugars and other articles in Canada addressed the House, that we should have heard a more complete disclaimer in connection with combines than we have yet received. I give the hon. gentleman from Montreal perfect credit for what he said. I accept his disclaimer just as far as it goes, and no further. He said there was no combine amongst manufacturers with a view to keeping up prices, but that is by no means all that the manufacturers were charged with. If I accept his disclaimer of a combination amongst sugar manufacturers for the purpose of keeping up prices he must permit me to remind him that he also acknowledged a connection with the Grocers' Union. Now, consumers of sugar are not very apt to make nice distinctions, and if the acknowledgement is made publicly between gentlemen known to be connected with the manufacturers and those to whom they sell, the public very naturally come to the conclusion that they are all in the same boat. I wish to make a few remarks upon the position in which the manufacturers of different kinds of sugar, manufacturers of cotton, and other manufacturers, are placed under the National Policy of Canada. What privileges were they promised under that great measure? They were promised a certain amount of protection by law; they were promised a monopoly of the Canadian market, so far as they could maintain that monopoly by means of the protective duty which was laid upon the importation of foreign goods. There was no absolute monopoly promised them, but only such a one as they could by their good management and their skill secure with the duty which was laid upon these articles if imported from abroad. But it never was suggested that importations from