

to by car. They were paying as much in Toronto as I was paying at my mill, and they got the price up to 95 cents, and the object was to take out of the farmers the 5 cents it cost them to get the wheat down to their mills. I say that was unfair; it was a combine against the farmers at once. I ran out of wheat, or nearly so, and went to Toronto, and what did I find? I found that I could buy plenty of wheat, but I could not get it down to my place without paying 8 to 9 and 10 cents a bushel, while the millers combined and got it at 5; but I was told: "If you go and join the Millers Association you can get it at the same rate." I said: "No; I will do nothing of the kind; I will take the wheat and pay the price, and lose the difference rather than do anything of the sort." I had several invitations from the Millers Association to go and meet them, but I would not go. I do not believe in such things at all. I do not care what the combine is, whether it is sugar, salt, labor or anything else, I think it is altogether wrong. Now, as to the farmers, I do not think it is possible for them to make such combines: I know enough about them. I was brought up on a farm, and I have dealt with farmers, and I call myself the farmers' friend, and feel it my duty to do all I can to help them, and perhaps I have done so to my own injury pecuniarily. It is a matter of no consequence whether a man has much or little, so long as he goes through the world right and comes out right side up in the end. My hon. friend from Monck gave a shot at the cold water men. I think he was wrong there. He should never have brought that into a combine. I am a cold water man, and I glory in it. If I live until the 19th day of next June I shall have been 63 years a total abstainer from all intoxicating beverages. Sooner than I would sell or drink a glass of liquor I would let my hon. friend take off my right hand. That is my principle, and I act upon it. Whenever I start upon a thing I mean to carry it out, and I mean to do so in this case, by voting that the Bill be placed on the Orders of the Day. I do not believe in taking an extravagant price for anything I have to sell, or giving an extravagant price for anything I have to buy. If anyone tries to impose upon me I let him severely alone. I am trying to do my business in such a way that when I lie down at night I can feel at ease and go to sleep with a good clear conscience.

HON. MR. THIBAUDEAU—I think that one more voice should be heard from the Province of Quebec, and as representative from that part of the Dominion I think that you will allow me to say something on the subject. Politics sometimes tell strange tales. A majority, I believe, of those who are now advocating this amendment to the existing laws have not always shown such tenderness for the consumer. When the high tariff was imposed upon this country those hon. gentlemen said very little about the consumer. The National Policy, however, induced capitalists to invest largely in manufacturing industries in this country, and it seems strange that, having brought about this condition of affairs, a Bill should be introduced to legislate against the very class for whom we legislated in 1879, and who, under that legislation, have invested largely in establishing manufacturing industries in our country. In the Province of Quebec, so far, the business arrangements which some hon. gentlemen speak of as combines have not been looked upon as combines, but as arrangements for the protection of the capital that we have ourselves induced capitalists to invest in our country. We should have no class legislation: there should not be legislation entirely for the consumers, but legislation which will be equally beneficial to the consumer and to the manufacturer. In the Province of Quebec we have had combinations. We have had a combination, for instance, of the cotton manufacturers. It has been more beneficial to the thousands of hands employed in the cotton factories than to the shareholders. This combination, or business arrangement, as I call it, was not made with the idea of increasing profits, but to keep the mills going and the hands employed. At times they have been obliged to discontinue night work entirely, because they can ascertain whether stocks are increasing or diminishing, and where they found the stocks so large that it was unnecessary to produce so much, they reduced the hours from 10 to 8, and sometimes had only five working days in the week instead of 6. Will anybody tell me that such an arrangement was not more favorable to the hands than if the mills had been closed for three or four months, throwing a number of hands idle upon the streets, with no choice but to beg, or steal, or go to the United States? I believe