

the committee. I think these words "unduly" and "unreasonably" strike very hard at the minority on that committee, because they were always talking about the undue influence of those combines, those unreasonable combines. We do not want anything that is unreasonable; we do want what is reasonable. We thought so last year, and we think so again, and we think that those words should remain in the Bill. The hon. gentleman from Toronto spoke truly when he stated that the biggest combination that we know of is the very combination that is represented by the three gentlemen who were in the minority on this committee. The meeting of the committee was put off from day to day in order that they might have the benefit of what they, the representatives of the farmers, had to say in support of this Bill. The representatives of the great farming association of the west came before the committee, and each one of them told us all that he had to say, but I do not think that it helped us a great deal, because after they had got through I do not think we knew anything more about what we had to do than we did before. But even these representative men did not seem to be deeply impressed with the nature of the Bill before us, because I have a solemn declaration, taken before a commissioner for taking affidavits in Montreal, which I will read to the House:—

"MONTREAL, 5th May, 1890.

"To the Hon. A. W. OGILVIE,  
"Senator, Ottawa.

"SIR,—After the meeting held by the Committee of the Senate, on Friday, the 2nd instant, on Banking and Commerce, the three representatives from the Central Farmers Union of Ontario expressed their opinions freely to Mr. C. P. Hebert and myself, and stated that had they seen a copy of the Wallace Bill as was proposed and passed by him through the lower House, and is now before your honorable House for adoption, that they would not have left home as representatives of their union. They stated it was entirely a Bill of class legislation for trades unions and against the farmers' interests.

"I remain, yours truly,  
"D. L. LOCKERBY.

"I hereby declare that the above is correct.

"CHARLES P. HEBERT.

"Montreal, 5th May, 1890.

"JAMES A. TAYLOR,

"A commissioner of the S. C. for the Province of Quebec for use in the Province of Ontario, also for the Province of Quebec."

Now, after putting ourselves to a great deal of inconvenience, and postponing our meetings to hear those farmers, in order

to hear what they had to urge in favor of this Bill, they find that they have totally misapprehended the purport of it.

HON. MR. POWER—They only looked at the second clause of it.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I think that the day is past, in these days of railways, steamers and telegraphs, for the people to be oppressed by combinations. There may be combinations in the United States, but they do not exist in this country. After spending so much time in talking about a question that is not in issue we might now confine ourselves to what is before the House. There is nothing before us to prove that the law is a hardship to anybody, as we passed it last year. That being the case, I think it is better to leave it alone, and until it is proved to us that the law with these two words in it is a hardship and an injury to any class of people in the country, or to the country generally, then let us leave it alone. I do think, with all due deference to those gentlemen who are my superiors in knowledge and in years, that we had better confine ourselves to the questions before the House, and leave sugar and salt combines and other combines out of this debate.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—This Bill was sent to me from the other House. Unfortunately when it was introduced here I did not happen to be in the Chamber. It is not an extraordinary Bill. It only deals with two or three words, but hardly anybody here would venture to father it. The senior member for Halifax was kind enough to take charge of it until I came in. My hon. friend from Toronto has said that all this agitation is simply clap-trap. Does he mean to tell this House that the 215 members of Parliament who represent the people of this country would pass a Bill the second time in that Chamber if it was nothing but clap-trap? I am sure that the hon. gentleman must have forgotten himself when he made such a statement. I remember the time when sugar refining was an infant industry in this country. The refiners came knocking at the doors of Parliament asking for assistance, and what did they say? Grant us what we ask and sugar will cost you no more than it has hitherto cost, and we will have the advantage of employing the labor in our own country and refining our own sugar.