

addressed me

4, 1893.

confirming that,
of the possible
of Canada.
of we shall
properties and

ll explain the
of the Cale-
ed of this change,
allowed.

WHITNEY.

ance of Mr.
responsibility
mon an early
y I addressed

CE,

7. 4, 1893.

en Caledonia."
g further had
on Parliament.
f the telegram
Mr. Snow, one
quiring into the
is would seem
their minds. I
u whether you
your telegram

NG,

Secretary.

On receipt of that letter Mr. Whitney, on the 7th January, telegraphed me as follows :—

BOSTON, Jan. 7, 1893.

HON. W. S. FIELDING, *Halifax*.

I beg to confirm the assurance in my telegram of December thirty-first. I think our friends will not delay on account of this disallowance matter. But the thing is going ahead when you give us the legislation, either with or without all my present associates.

HENRY M. WHITNEY.

I then notified Mr. Whitney that the Legislature had been summoned, and there was an exchange of telegrams in reference to the withdrawal of signatures to the mining companies' petition to Ottawa asking for the disallowance of our Act of last session consolidating the Acts respecting Mines and Minerals. Mr. Whitney telegraphed under date Boston, Jan. 10, 1893, that Mr. Henry, as solicitor, would withdraw on behalf of the Caledonia, International and Little Glace Bay companies. I replied on the following day that if the petition were withdrawn a settlement of the disallowance matter might be hastened, but that the withdrawal of the companies named, while others remained on the petition, was of no consequence.

That, sir, is all the correspondence that the Government has had with Mr. Whitney and his associates in reference to this very important matter.

PARTICULARS OF THE AGREEMENT.

Now we have reached a point when it becomes necessary to give particulars of the precise arrangements we have made. Although the matter has not been laid before the Legislature, it has been much discussed in the press, and there has been raised a somewhat wide-spread cry of monopoly. Let us first understand what a monopoly is, and what proceedings must be taken to establish it. I could mention combines existing not very far from this place to which we might reasonably reject as being bad. But what I wish to suggest is that there may be good combines as well as bad. When two men are doing certain work which could be more economically done by one, a combine for the purpose of producing the same result at a smaller expenditure may be a good to the community rather than an evil. Therefore the mere fact that certain gentlemen propose to place a number of properties under one management, with a view to economy and better results, does not necessarily imply monopoly. If we gave to one man or one corporation certain privileges, and guaranteed that