

but every citizen of the country. If that were not the object we would not be in it; why should we be? The other day a fruit combine was unearthed by Commissioner Duncan—and I may say in passing that you will live a long while before you will find the Tory party digging into a combine. Oh no; they would rather snuggle up to it. I had an opportunity of discussing this fruit combine with my colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) and he indicated in a general way what was coming. Before the report was tabled or even printed we were taking action to meet the situation. Representatives of the fruit and vegetable trade all over Canada were convened in Ottawa, working out a policy to combat that combine through the establishment of a nation-wide brokerage agency of their own. You never heard of anything like that under a Tory government. Look at the story of it! I have here a report on ocean freight rates by the present hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton)—one of the knighted gentlemen who were looking into this matter. He never got close enough to it, however, to hurt either it or himself. I see that my hon. friend is just coming into the chamber, and I am glad, I ventured the prediction a while ago that he would not speak on this question, and I am going to keep to that guess. Now, this is a report by H. L. Drayton, K.C.—I assume that is my hon. friend—printed by the Government Printing Bureau at Ottawa. There is nothing wrong in it, and from what my hon. friend says in this report I am sure he can conscientiously support this resolution. He says:

With this end in view, I endeavoured to obtain the appointment of a joint commission to make a thorough and complete investigation of, and to report on the methods and practices, and rates and charges of ocean carriers doing business, or from time to time doing business, between ports in the United Kingdom, or any of them, and ports in the Dominion of Canada, or any of them; and also of all terminal companies or port authorities of any port in the United Kingdom or in the Dominion of Canada through which traffic, whether of passengers or freight, between the United Kingdom and the Dominion of Canada passes, and also to investigate into and report on all insurance charges or other expenses that shippers from the United Kingdom to Canada, or vice versa, are subject to as the case may be.

I further represented that the commission, in addition to reporting its findings in the above matters, should also recommend what, if any, legislation the commission deemed advisable should be passed by the Imperial parliament, or by the parliament of the Dominion, or by both.

He suggests the advisability of legislation. Well, we have legislation before us. My hon. friends opposite promise or suggest, while we perform—that is the difference. I quote further:

I further represented that it was necessary that the commission should have authority to sit at such places it might desire, either in the United Kingdom or in the Dominion of Canada, with authority to compel the attendance of witnesses, production of documents, books, papers, etc., and to administer oaths; and also that the commission should have the right to employ accountants, etc.

We did that two years ago before what was called the McMaster committee. The inquiry went on for weeks—I do not know how long; we thought it was going to drain the treasury to pay the expenses of the witnesses. That committee submitted three or four interim reports. The hon. member for West York, in this report, suggested investigation either in Great Britain or in Canada. We have had it in Canada, and in a week or two we will call to this country everybody in England who wants to come and attend the hearing before the special committee. In his report the hon. member for West York also said:

I further impressed upon the Imperial authorities that it was the desire of the Canadian government that the investigation should be entered on in the near future, and, if possible, a report made so as to enable any necessary action to be taken by that government at the ensuing session of parliament.

He suggested that steps should be taken to make action possible "at the ensuing session of parliament." This was in 1913; so that the hon. member had in mind exactly what we are doing. I do not know how he can object to our legislation, unless it be from the point of view of party loyalty. I have a high regard for that myself, and that would be the only justification for taking a stand against the report. However, I will not take any delight in seeing my hon. friend try to look both ways, because we all have to do it sometimes; in this team work we are engaged in it cannot be avoided. But under ordinary circumstances, where party fealty or party loyalty was not involved, I am sure that if my hon. friend were of the same opinion now that he was when he submitted the report from which I have quoted, he would support this resolution without reservation.

No combines ever admit guilt; they are not expected to, except indirectly, in their defence. My experience with wrongdoers is that they are not very courageous; throw the light of open day upon them and they soon take cover. That was the experience in the case of the elevator combine, and also in the case of the fruit combine, in the western country and again in the Annapolis valley. What is all this commotion about throughout the country? What is all this lobbying for? What is all this advertising for? As a matter of fact this institution, this conference—that is its Sunday name—has been torpedoed amidstips and is in