

a case into court under this law, with these words in it; but no name was mentioned of any lawyer that we might be guided by his eminence in his profession or his ability as a legal man. No written opinion was presented to the committee; there was nothing presented to them but the bare statement that some lawyers had held that the words "unduly and unreasonably" had rendered the Act inoperative. It happens that in this House there are lawyers of considerable legal eminence, and these hon. gentlemen, far from considering that these words had vitiated the law in any way, felt that it was absolutely necessary to have them there, otherwise it might prevent combinations which would be made in the interests of the public instead of being adverse to them. Consequently this necessary precaution of saying that they were not to be undue or unreasonable was put in. I am not going to detain the House by entering into any argument as to the course which should be pursued with regard to this report. The committee have presented their views. The first clause of the Bill, which relates to the taking out of these two words, was almost alone discussed before the committee. A vote of 16 to 3, if my memory serves me right, upon that question decided whether these words should be expunged or not—that is to say, whether the Bill as presented to us for consideration should be passed. It certainly indicates a large amount of unanimity amongst the members of the committee on that question. With reference to the second clause, very little was said. The second clause of the Bill is to the following effect:

"5. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to the exercise of any handicraft or to the performance of labor, and subject to such exception they shall be construed as if section twenty-two of 'The Trade Unions Act' had not been enacted."

HON. MR. SCOTT—Your report does not touch that at all.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes; the report touches both clauses. In the Act which it seeks to amend, that was passed last year, we have this clause—the one which the proposed Bill would strike out:

"The foregoing provisions of this Act shall be construed as if section twenty-two of the Trade Union Act had not been enacted."

I do not myself see much difference between the clause which this proposes to strike out and the one proposed to be substituted in its place. To my mind they

do not seem to differ at all in their effect. The original clause, clause 22 of the Trade Unions Act, which was repealed last year, and which, by the proposed section it is proposed still to keep repealed, is in these words:

"The purposes of any trade union shall not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, be deemed to be unlawful, so as to render any member of such trade union liable to criminal prosecution for conspiracy or otherwise, or so as to render void or voidable any agreement or trust."

No argument was adduced before the committee in support of this, and when the motion was made to strike out the clause it was carried without any discussion, to the best of my recollection; consequently, the report was drawn up recommending that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

HON. MR. READ (Quinté)—Before this report is adopted I would like to say a few words. There was no discussion upon this Bill in this House at its second reading. It was sent to the committee where it was supposed it would be thoroughly looked into; that is the reason why no discussion took place on it in this House. It is within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen that this Bill was passed by the other House last year, and we amended it here.

This Bill, to repeal our amendment of last year, was introduced in the House of Commons this Session, where it was passed unanimously, as they considered it in the people's interest. Such being the case, I think it is our duty to look into this matter and see if that amendment is in the people's interest or if it is in the interest of a few. I shall try with my humble ability to show that it is in the interest of a few and not in the interest of many. I can see in this Bill that the National Policy is on its trial. Either we have to defeat these combines or the National Policy is not a success. I say that we should show that combines should not exist, and we should make it so that they cannot exist, in order that the National Policy shall be a success. What did I say, as far as I could say, some years ago, in this House, in asking for the adoption of a National Policy? I said that the National Policy would create industries in our midst, and in the creation of these industries competition would arise that would benefit the country. I did not at all think that combinations would arise under the National Policy, and that the public