

vantage being taken of the home consumer, comes nearer to equality so far as the consumer is concerned, and nearer to being fair than a tariff which is just 1 per cent under the Conservative tariff for the last forty years, and under which the beneficiary is allowed to take any advantage he desires.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we can cooperate with the Conservatives when that policy is applied, as against the policy we have had during the last seven years. During the last elections I told my constituents that so far as I was concerned I had no intention of worrying about Liberal or Conservative parties, but I intended to deal with matters on their merits, and I have tried to follow that policy for the last seven years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was the hon. member aware, when he made that statement, that the Conservatives were blaming this government for not raising the tariff, and they moved an amendment to that effect?

Mr. KENNEDY: Speeches have been made on both sides of the house, and if we were to take the statements made over there regarding reductions and compare them with the statements made over here advocating raising the tariff, they would just about counterbalance. What I am interested in is the actual application of the policies.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely you could not cooperate in asking that the tariff be raised?

Mr. KENNEDY: If you can prevent the fellow who gets the raise in tariff from taking advantage of it, that is a different thing entirely. As I have stated, it would come nearer to equality so far as the people of the country are concerned than anything which has been done by the Liberal party, in spite of all its pledges to protect the consumer.

As the balance of my remarks would bear on the amendment and the main motion, and because I have come to a point—

Mr. LAPOINTE: A crucial point.

Mr. KENNEDY: —where I can close my remarks, I will do so as my time has nearly expired.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the budget which has been discussed almost to the limit of sufficiency, but I only desire to take up the time allotted to me in drawing attention to a resolution which I placed on the order paper about six weeks ago, but which will not be reached owing to the action of the govern-

ment in appropriating the private members' days for the rest of the session. My resolution was as follows:

Whereas the affairs of the Manufacturers Finance Corporation were placed in the hands of a liquidator last year;

And whereas a balance sheet was issued only a very short time before the liquidation, showing a very prosperous and satisfactory condition of the finances of the company;

And whereas the interim liquidator has issued a report showing an apparent deficit of over \$3,000,000.

Therefore be it resolved, that, in the opinion of this house, it is desirable that the select standing committee on banking and commerce be instructed to investigate the said matter and to report if any means could be adopted for the better protection of the interests of the public.

I am unable to discuss that as a resolution and I have withdrawn it from the order paper in order that I may be able to discuss it now. Under some technicality of the rules I find that I can introduce a motion during the routine proceedings at the beginning of the daily session that this matter be referred to the select standing committee on banking and commerce. As that motion would not be debatable I am taking advantage of the opportunity to explain it now in the hope that hon. members will remember my remarks and support the resolution without any explanation being offered at the time it is introduced. That is the only way in which I can bring it before the committee on banking and commerce. I do not want merely to talk about it; I want to see some action taken in connection with it.

It is not necessary for me to go into the details of this unsavoury mess. It is sufficient, I should think, to make out only a prima facie case for its submission to the committee, and for them to take such action as they may deem wise. The facts as known to us all, as established by the press, will be sufficient justification. This company was formed for the very laudable and legitimate purpose of discounting commercial paper in connection with chattels such as motor cars, pianos, other musical instruments, and so forth. It was specially mentioned in their propaganda to sell their stock, how thoroughly secure the investors were. They were protected by no less than four or five separate provisions. First of all they had the lien on chattel itself, let us say a motor car or piano; secondly, they had the note of the purchaser who was supposed to have paid a substantial sum on it; then they had the note of the garageman who had sold him the car, and further back than that they had the note of the manufacturer. If that was not sufficient