

that here were three articles that were outside the combine; is not that an admission that everything else is inside? What kind of consolation would it be to shippers of thousands of other articles to know that four of them were not in the combine? Only the shippers of those four articles would care much about them; all the other articles would be under the combine. After all, there was nothing to it had it been true, which it was not, but I absolve my hon. friend from any guilty intention. Does the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) understand now where he gets off at?

Mr. BOYS: As clear as mud.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have got you on that, anyway.

Mr. BOYS: You are entertaining anyhow, nothing else.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, we have got you on that point. Here is the next one. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) said that we could not specify the commodities. Well, how many commodities are there left when you control them all? The agreement provides in paragraph (d):

That the control and regulation of the rates to be charged by the contractor shall rest with the government of Canada and that government shall fix such transportation rates on all commodities from time to time.

Now how many do you leave when you get them all fixed? The opposition must be up against it very badly for argument when they think there is something left after you include them all. They are up against it pretty badly. Everybody has been commenting on the weakness and feebleness of their attack; it is lamentable, it is pathetic. After all the bluster and braggadocio and filibustering they have done, that is the sole result after the attack by one of their best men—because he is one of the best of them over there, and that is saying a good deal because there are some good debaters over there.

Another complaint was that we could not send any of these ships to the Pacific coast. If that were true that would be a real grievance, because I think Vancouver is one of the most promising ports in Canada. But what does the agreement provide? Paragraph (a) provides that the contractor shall:

Build, equip, provide, establish and during this contract, continue and in the manner hereinafter mentioned, operate a regular shipping service between such ports in Great Britain or Ireland or the continent of Europe, and Canadian ports as may be designated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce for Canada or his representatives from time to time.

Canadian ports—that means all. Again, how many are left when you include them all? That includes Vancouver, Prince Rupert, the ports on Hudson bay, if you like, St. John and Halifax, Montreal and Quebec, and any others there are. Why it is a barn door; how much wider does my hon. friend want it? It must be a pretty watertight contract when that is the weakest spot they can pick on.

Another point made by hon. gentlemen opposite was that this contract may be abandoned over night; but the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) thought the contract was so good that if it was his he would stick to it all his life. Now what are you going to make out of that? It cannot be good and bad at the same time. I want to say that the hon. member for Centre Toronto made some of the most pertinent and I think some of the most effective remarks regarding the contract and the way it would work out, provided we went the wrong way about of putting it into effect, that is, if we attempted to put a low rate on everything and act as if we did not know which side of our bread the butter was on. The hon. member made some very sensible remarks in connection with that contingency, which we do not intend to run the risk of; no sensible person would. Let us see what he said besides,—and this shows the bent of the Tory mind on the control of rates. The hon. member for Centre Toronto takes the ground that after all, we are all liable to error, and that if this rate-fixing institution called a combine has made a mistake here and there, it is only what the railway commission has done. Now what do you know of that, Mr. Speaker. If they made a mistake, it is only what the railway commission has done, and they should be given the same fair consideration. He puts this rate-controlling institution known as the combine, which this gentleman recognized as a regular institution apparently with somebody in authority, on a parity with the railway commission. He says:

They should be given the same fair consideration which the railway commission gives the two railways of this country in the matter of fixing rates for their traffic.

The right hon. leader of the opposition never misses an opportunity to castigate the Minister of Agriculture for some alleged statement he made regarding the railway commission. That was when I was a private member. Of course, I had no right to say anything against the railway commission then, but I said it just the same. Now here is someone quite a little closer to my right hon. friend than the Minister of Agriculture, and he brackets