

*Ocean Shipping Rates*

sit down. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was asked that question, as also were the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Low) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), but no one has answered it. In all sincerity I am asking the Minister of Agriculture whether or not the statement is correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What statement?

Mr. BOYS: That wheat, flour, sugar and cattle were not included.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Was my hon. friend not in the chamber when the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) presented the evidence in the matter?

Mr. BOYS: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend wait until I am through? He will have no doubt as to where he stands.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend talks about bluff and evasion; I think we are getting a little of it now. I am asking the minister to say whether these articles have been under the conference rates.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Sit down and give me a chance to talk. In reality the hon. member for Vancouver Centre was not quite sure himself whether it was correct or not, because he repeats it not once, not twice, but thrice. If my hon. friend will wait I will read the question as it was put on those three occasions.

Mr. BOYS: Give us the answer, that is what we want. Do not let us have a burlesque made of this.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have my own way of making my remarks.

Mr. BOYS: All right; go ahead then, you are harmless.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre, putting the question again, said:

I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce, his colleague; Am I right or am I wrong in asserting that wheat, flour, sugar and cattle are exempted from the conference rates? He can accept the advice of my hon. friend behind him. Not one of them will dispute it. They know perfectly well I am right.

Then he went on to say: "I make the statement and you can prove I am wrong." That was certainly a fallacy that I have never before heard enunciated in this House. Well, the hon. member goes at it again, and he says:

I repeat that wheat, flour, sugar and cattle are not, and never have been, included in the conference rates.

[Mr. Boys.]

I state further that I have this from shipping authorities both in Montreal and in other sections. I am not going to go any further in regard to quotations.

He has it from those who are under suspicion. What a delightful authority that is! "I have it from the combine itself," he says. And what more need be said? He prefers to accept that evidence—until the sworn evidence is produced which was taken before the special committee of which the hon. member for Brome was the chairman. When that sworn evidence was brought down showing that all these articles except sugar were under the conference rates, then my hon. friend, with the greatest grace, crawls down and says: "I never said so." The hon. member for Brome had the sworn evidence and he was showing that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre was wrong, when that hon. gentleman interrupted him:

Mr. Stevens: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt?

Mr. McMaster: Yes.

Mr. Stevens: The hon. member is not quite right. I said that these articles were not now and had not been for some time affected by the conference rates.

"Were not now, and had not been for some time;" that is quite a different statement altogether. He goes on:

They were at one time, because I am quite aware of the fact that the United States government interfered in regard to flour, so that my hon. friend is quite right in regard to that.

Oh yes, that is quite a different story. On three successive occasions he said they were not now and had not been under the conference rates, and then when the hon. member for Brome draws attention to the fact he was not correct, he points out that he did not catch that right; and I want to give my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre credit, I think he thought he was telling the truth. We have never found him otherwise, but he knows when to crawl down, and that is what some people do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Might I remark it is very evident tonight this government does.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is all right; I will attend to my right hon. friend in a few minutes. Here was the evidence given:

There is no fixed rate on flour. We have what might be called a gentleman's agreement as to rates on flour.

Then we have the evidence of another gentleman by the name of Cunningham. He says there is a fixed rate on grain. So the evidence they got from the combine itself was not very reliable, and if they had got a little more information about sugar the chances are it would be under the combine too, and that is the only one left. But supposing it had been true, and they could truthfully say