

the sentiments of the people when they say that combines are not in the interest of the country. Why do we find gentlemen coming from Montreal, Toronto and other parts of the country in large numbers if they are not greatly interested? They would stay at home and attend to their business if they were not interested. The hon. gentleman told us that we ought to leave this in the hands of the courts. I think those who have the least to do with the courts will come out best in the end. Reference has been made to one of our departed Senators who was complaining of his losses on sugar, but his opinion on sugar combines I happen to know. One day as we sat in the committee room, while the combines evidence was being taken, he said laughingly: "I do not know but I have been in a little combine. I took \$20,000 in a sugar refinery in Boston and afterwards was induced to take more stock. It did not pay me for some time, and I thought it was not a good thing, but latterly I have been getting 3 per cent. a month, and the combine is not so bad on the sugar as I at one time thought it would be." Those were his words to me. Something has been said about salt: the opinion is, and I believe it is correct, that certain individuals said to the salt producers: "We will take all your salt and give you 70 cents a barrel, and sell it ourselves." Having all the salt, this combine said: "This is a good thing; salt cannot be imported in competition with us, and we will put our price on it." Those of us who had been purchasing salt for \$1 a barrel did not know for a time that there was anything wrong. I had occasion to send a team for some salt, and I gave the usual amount of money to bring back a load, and when the team returned the quantity was less than usual. Then I learned that salt had risen to \$1.50 per barrel. Who gets the increased price? Seventy cents is the first price, 35 to 40 cents is the cost of transportation, and where does the balance go? Not to those who produced the salt, but to those who controlled the trade, those who sat quietly by and caught the bird while the others beat the bush. The consumer is so much out. These things have occurred within our own knowledge. Now, it is just the same with these wholesale grocers. Do they work; do they produce; are they employers of labor? No; they sit by, write an order to a refiner for

forty, fifty or one hundred barrels of sugar, pay for it in forty-eight days, get the best pay they can from their customers, and pocket the balance. They are the drones that are taking the honey, and the working bees are producing it. I am one of those who have always believed in a protective policy for this country, but it never entered into my mind that cotton manufactures would be produced under the National Policy. I was more than surprised when cotton factories were established. If they have not been successful it is not a disappointment to me, and I might also almost place sugar refineries in the same category, because they are not exactly adapted to the conditions of this country. The effect of these combines has been explained often. Take the case of Mr. Matthewson: it shows the tyranny that can be practised upon a merchant. I see by the evidence that where he had been a customer at one place for thirty years they refused to sell to him because he would not join this holy alliance. It proves, first of all, that he was a long time in business, and it proves also that because he would not knuckle down, because he had the spirit and independence of a man, they refused to sell him supplies on the same terms as others. I think that that alone is sufficient to warrant me in doing everything in my power to defeat any combine that may exist.

HON. MR. CLEMOW—This debate has been very long, and I must ask the indulgence of the House to say a few words in reference to some of the points that have been brought forward by some hon. gentleman who have spoken. I was upon the Banking and Commerce Committee, and took every pains to ascertain from the various witnesses whether they had any grievance to complain of. I did all I could to get a fair and undisturbed hearing for every man who appeared before the committee, and I did not hear one man express himself as dissatisfied with the operation of the Act—I could not find one solitary instance where injury had been inflicted upon a community owing to the presence of those two words in the Act. I think it is a misnomer to call this the Combines Bill; I rather think that the proper term would have been: Bill for the purpose of preventing persons from protecting themselves in a legitimate way in their trade.