

We carry out the principle of protection throughout our lives. Every man does so more or less. I cannot understand why there should be such a difficulty in arriving at a decision in this matter. It is true that some gentlemen have quoted instances where grievances have occurred. They have instanced the salt combine. They say that salt costs the combine \$1.15 per barrel and that they sell it for \$1.50. Is 35 cents a barrel on salt an unreasonable profit for the man who has embarked his capital in the business and undertaken some risk? If so, the courts of justice are open to give redress to anyone who may be injured in that way. If I were in the position of those who complain of this I would seek redress in the courts. I am told that it would be expensive, but if there is an outcry against combines throughout the country there should be no difficulty in procuring funds to bring a test case before the courts. No such action has been taken. I have not seen the petition, or heard one man in this country say that he feels aggrieved. Would the Senate, therefore, be justified in listening to the appeals of gentlemen from the other House who tell us that because the Bill has passed the House of Commons we must also pass it? I think that this is a matter legitimately and properly belonging to the functions of the Senate. The members of this House are gentlemen acquainted with trade and the customs of trade, and they can form deliberate and just conclusions with respect to the operations of this Act—in my opinion equal if not superior to the judgment of members of the other House. I am perfectly willing to listen to anyone who can bring forward a real grievance, and am willing, if it can be proved, to assist in making restitution to those who may be injured, as far as Parliament can. We have heard a good deal about farmers' combines. I do not suppose that they enter into arrangements in black and white, but they do combine. They have often held their wheat and oats and hay for years—for what purpose? For the purpose of getting better prices. To that there can be no objection; it is what every man in this Chamber and in this country would do if he could. I do not see, therefore, what necessity there is for making this onslaught upon the words of this Bill, because if it is unreasonable or undue restriction on trade, the courts of

law are open to punish the offenders; but I think it would not be right to require that they should be subject to punishment for something that is not unreasonable and undue. I do not think the Senate will stultify itself by undoing now what was deliberately done by the majority a year ago. When we pass a law we should wait until we ascertain whether it is effective or not before undertaking to amend it, I do not suppose that the Senate will persevere in its present attitude, if evidence can be shown, by petition or otherwise, that there is a general desire in the country that the law should be amended. When that time comes the Senate will bow to the decision of the many; but, as we are constituted, we ought to protect the interests of all parties. The interests of capitalists and manufacturers should be just as sacred in the eyes of this House as the interests of the workingmen, or any other section of the community. As business men, we can understand this subject as well as any other persons in the country. A great deal has been said about monopolies in Canada. I have yet to hear any evidence that we have any great monopoly. Surely if there was anything of the kind we would have heard something of it. I am told that these gentlemen who came down from the west to support this Bill went away with their minds quite changed with regard to the effects of the law. They said if they had known how it really stood they would not have taken the trouble of coming to Ottawa for the purpose of supporting the Bill. Is it not right that men who have invested largely in the industries of this country should have the opportunity of conducting their business in such a way as to prevent ruin to their interests by over-trading and over-production? I think it is but fair that they should be allowed to co-operate for the proper management of their business, subject, of course, to doing so in a fair and legitimate way. One effect of the present system is that it has curtailed, to a very great extent, the credit system, which I consider was a great bane and worked serious injury to the country. The credit system prevailed generally, and the effect of this mutual arrangement among those engaged in the legitimate trade of the country has been to place business operations on a safer footing than ever before. If it has had no other effect