

that, in such cases, combines are beneficial to all, and more particularly to the employés, because when the manufacturers are running their establishments on short time the hands at least earn enough to live upon. They may have to do with a little less drink, but at least they can provide food for their families. Take another subject—the insurance business. The insurance companies of this country are combined—why? For the benefit of the citizens themselves. How could the insurance companies enforce their rules for the proper construction of buildings, so as to diminish the danger of fire, without such a combination? How could they force those who use boilers and steam engines to pave the engine rooms with asphalt? How could insurance companies compel builders to insulate electric wires? I know of houses that have been burned down because the electric wires used were the wires for bell-hangers. The insurance companies have not only protected themselves, but they have protected the community—they have protected the owners of houses and their neighbors from large conflagrations, by forcing builders to use proper precautions in putting in wires. Unless such precautions were taken, the companies combined not to insure them, and this combination is beneficial to the people they insure. Take railways: many of our citizens are more or less shareholders in railway companies. It is well-known that the railway companies settle rates and make business arrangements among themselves, and that is called a combine. How could you expect railways to run in this country if, by such sweeping legislation as this, they were allowed to cut rates and destroy each other? If our great trunk lines did not pay, you would not find English and American capitalists investing so largely in our railways and opening up our backwoods to settlement. Take marine insurance: the companies combine and pool rates and risks, and that part of the business could never be done without such business arrangements, so that the legislation that is sought here to-day is simply legislation that would destroy important industries in this country and deter capitalists from investing in large enterprises. If this Bill should become law manufacturers could not agree among themselves in the dull time to curtail operations and reduce production in such a

way as to keep their hands employed without overstocking the market. I remember the time when there was an outcry against making this Dominion a slaughter market for United States manufacturers. If we do not protect our own manufacturers, do you think that they will not slaughter in this market? They will slaughter worse than the Americans ever did, and, therefore, I think it is the duty of this House, after having induced capitalists to invest in this country, to protect them. If we had no legislation on our Statute-book to prevent undue and unwarrantable restrictions on trade I would certainly ask for such legislation, but we have an Act which meets the case. Is there any combine in the sugar industry equivalent to the great New York sugar combine? If so, it could be dealt with under this law, but no such combine exists in Canada. Let any hon. gentleman who spoke in favor of this amendment show a single case where a combine has been unduly and unreasonably carried out, and I am sure that our judges, to whose discretion it is left entirely, will punish them in the courts. But if you erase these two words from our Statute-book you actually place the large capital that we have induced people to invest in this country at a disadvantage. Large factories have been erected under our legislation and thousands of men have been induced to abandon the cultivation of the soil and earn their living in the factories; yet we are asked to withdraw protection from this class of people. You may, by strict legislation against combines, favor the farmers a little. I admit that, but when you were so hard on the farmers as to adopt the National Policy I do not see why you should be so tender in dealing with them to-day. It is no reason, because you hit them hard before, that you should now hit the manufacturers, who are the very life and soul of our large centres of population. It is very strange that in the Province of Quebec—I speak especially of the district of Montreal, where the largest manufactures exist—that nobody complains, not even of the sugar combine. It would look as if in Ontario people were more anxious to work an election dodge than anything else. I believe I am speaking pretty much the voice and the sentiments of the district of Montreal in saying that the Province of Quebec wishes that the law relating to combines