

After the statute of 1889 had been on the books for ten years and had been consolidated in the interval in 1892 in the Criminal Code as Section 520, Dr. Sproule brought in an amendment to remove the word unduly in three cases and unreasonably in one, mentioning that he was seeking these changes "for the simple reason we are told that it would be impossible under the existing law as it stands to secure a conviction of any persons guilty of combining in restraint of trade. It would put upon a prosecutor the onus of proving a great many things which it would be very difficult to prove. How could one prove what unduly enhanced the price or restrained trade? . . . . This law has been on the statute book many years and efforts have been made from time to time to get the Attorney General of the Province to prosecute under the Act, and several times applications had been made to private individuals to do so and they all raised the same objection, that it would be impossible to secure a conviction under the law as it reads."

Note--

-----  
It therefore appears that the legislation introduced by Mr. Clarke Wallace was of no value during the ten years from 1889 to 1899.  
-----

At this time Dr. Sproule read a petition from a number of tanners <sup>in Canada</sup> which had been sent to the Minister of Finance,

W. L. Mackenzie King Papers  
Volume 4