

ourselves when we are invited to make an amendment to a statute of this kind is, is there some sound argument by which it can be made clear to us that the words are hurtful and do interfere with the carrying out of the law as we designed? Have you any such evidence before you? Is there any petition from any part of the country to show that there has been an attempt to suppress unlawful combinations, and that the attempt has failed, because of the fact of these words "unduly" and "unreasonably" being in the Act? There has been no such evidence produced before the House. We are not bound to wait for petitions to amend an Act, but I do say we are bound to have some good and sufficient argument brought to bear upon our action in order that we may act wisely in making any change in an existing statute. The hon. gentlemen have gone on to explain all the evils of combines. I am willing to assent to what they have said. The House has already passed a law and put it on the Statute-book to prevent or suppress these combinations, but the hon. gentlemen have failed to show us that in order to make that law effective and useful it is necessary for us to eliminate these words. There is not an argument used by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of their proposition. My hon. friend from Lunenburg has spoken to the point, and has shown the desirability of these words being retained in the statute. Supposing the Bill were passed without amendment, in what state would it leave the law? The law as it is provides a punishment for any persons who unlawfully do any of these things. You will observe it must be unlawfully done—even if this Bill were adopted and the words "unduly" or "unreasonably" were expunged. It seems to me that there is very little difference between an unlawful Act or an Act done unreasonably or unduly. My belief is that if these words were not in the Act at all that any judge or jury trying a case brought under it to determine whether a combination was unlawful, would have to settle the question whether it was unduly or unreasonably done.

HON. MR. POWER—Then why are you so anxious to retain the words "unduly" or "unreasonably?"

HON. MR. VIDAL—Because they are there. We put them in last year after deliberate consideration.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—And because there is no reason shown why they should be taken out.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I have not yet heard a single reason advanced why they should be taken out. In committee the allegation was made that they hindered the Act from being put in force. What evidence have we of that? Has there ever been an attempt made to put it in force? Not the slightest; but because in the opinion of my hon. friends these words militate against the efficiency of the law they think we are bound to take their opinion and have no opinion of our own. The retention of these words in the law simply protects innocent and unoffending parties who combine together, and the result of that combination has no injurious effect upon the country. Without these words it would leave the working of the Act slightly ambiguous, and innocent parties entering into a combination might be found guilty by a court and be made subject to penalties when really the public interest was not affected by it at all. The words "unduly" and "unreasonably" were not inserted in the Act without mature judgment and deliberation, and I am certainly very sanguine that the House will sustain its committee in the action which they have taken in this matter, unless some good reason can be shown, or some evidence adduced to prove that the insertion of these words by us last year was a mistake, and we are bound to take them out. I think they were put in correctly, advisedly, with a good purpose, and we would be stultifying ourselves if we say, that because, the House of Commons desires to take them out we are bound to do it. I wonder that the hon. gentleman from Monck does not see the logical result of his arguments: The other House represents the people; therefore, their views should prevail. Follow that argument to its legitimate conclusion and what does it prove? That there is no reason for the existence of this House at all, because we do not represent the people, and that we have therefore no right to refuse to correct or amend a law passed by the Commons. The great reason for the existence of this Chamber is that it corrects legis-