

Now, are we to be told that the government will not accede to the motion, or at least that the hon. member for West Hastings should not push the motion, because the hon. the minister has since returned, at the request of the liquidator, the money which we say he should not have withdrawn? If the accused minister will state that the allegations of fact set forth in the resolution and set forth in the formal statement of facts preceding it, are not wrong, that the hon. member for West Hastings is not in the position of having falsely accused a fellow member of this House, then I see no reason at all to press the motion further. But as the case stands now if the motion is not pressed, then the hon. member for West Hastings is in the position of having put forward claims and allegations against a fellow-member which stand unsustainable. It is owing to the hon. member for West Hastings to give him an opportunity to establish his allegations if they are denied by the hon. minister; but if they are not denied, of course, there is no object in going any farther.

Now the Prime Minister says, as well: Oh, the member for West Hastings could have gone, or he could go yet, to Judge McKeown; others have been. Judge McKeown's is not the tribunal before whom the honour of a minister of the Crown should be tested in a matter affecting the privileges of parliament. Why, it is so absurd as almost to defy argument, the suggestion that because within the powers of a commission, which commission was appointed for a distinctly different purpose—to find out whether or not the government of Canada or the parliament of Canada should recoup depositors of the Home Bank—because within the general sweep of its powers, all impliedly for that purpose, all impliedly to be exercised in order to ascertain what shall be his report on that single question, the commission might track down the circumstances now before us therefore the regular procedure of this House is to be reversed and the committee on Privileges and Elections is not to have the opportunity of performing its duty. No, this suggestion does not admit of argument at all. The motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, embodies the proper procedure, and when charges are formally laid the committee on Privileges and Elections is the proper tribunal. Consequently, I do not see how the hon. member for West Hastings can be asked to retreat from the position he has taken, a position which on all fours is right, and which I think the government should accept.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Meighen.]

LAUSANNE CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would like to inform the House, on the Orders of the Day, that on Monday next I purpose to lay on the Table of the House by agreement with the British government certain of the papers respecting the Lausanne Conference and the Lausanne Treaty. They will be laid on the Table of the House in the Commons in London at the same time they are laid on the Table here. As I assume that members of the House will wish to have the opportunity of perusing this correspondence, I will take steps immediately to have it printed, assuming that the House will be willing to order the printing of a number of copies after the treaty has been laid on the Table.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT, 1907, AMENDMENT

The House in committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

3. Resolved, That Schedule A to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter twenty-six of the statutes of 1914, chapter nineteen of the statutes of 1922 and chapter forty-two of the statutes of 1923, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items: 275, 445, 445a, 446, 446a, 446b, 447a, 447b, 448, 448a, 448c, 449, 450, 453b, 591, 663, 682, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set opposite each of said items, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duty be inserted in Schedule A:—

On item 445:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask the minister, in connection with this resolution, whether the statement made, I think, by the Minister of Agriculture, that the manufacturers of agricultural implements were to have restored to them the Crowsnest pass rates, was or was not correct.

Mr. ROBB: I submit to my hon. friend that that has nothing whatever to do with the resolution under consideration now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It has a very profound influence upon the effect of these reductions on that industry. Their market is the western market, and it has been used before as an argument against reducing at all the customs tariff. In this budget debate, unless I am entirely mistaken in my recollection, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) made that statement. Is there any mystery about it?

Mr. ROBB: None whatever, so far as I am concerned.