

extent, without any regard to profit. But the result of the activities of a certain political party in the last two or three years has been to create the feeling that you cannot trust any man who has a responsible position in industry. I think the time has come when we should recognize that there are people in this country, regardless of their financial standing, who do want to win this war and are doing everything they can to that end. I vehemently resent therefore the insinuation that simply because a man happens to have an industry, or occupies some position that may carry a large salary with it, his sole idea is one of profit to himself. I have never questioned the loyalty of my fellow Canadians, and I resent with all the force I can put into it the idea that simply because some man happens to own an industry or to be interested in industry his only object is to make some profit out of the war, no matter what happens. I think we should have a full investigation into the charges made by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains, notwithstanding that he has withdrawn his statement. Let us go into the matter to the very bottom and show conclusively that the members of this house are certainly above any such imputation as that made by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I am wondering what purpose will be served by passing the motion after the withdrawal made by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains. If the hon. member had not withdrawn his statement that would be another matter, but in my opinion he withdrew unreservedly all references he made on the occasion in question. After Your Honour's request for a statement from the hon. member—I admit that his first explanation was not satisfactory—he did make a complete withdrawal. What can be gained by an investigation? I do not know that there are any damages or penalties that can be applied to the hon. member. We can find him guilty of making the statements and possibly he could be unseated and there would be another election. But I do not know that anything would be gained thereby. I suggest that under the circumstances, and taking into consideration also the circumstances under which the speech was made, it would be much better if the hon. member's withdrawal were accepted and the motion dropped.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEDUC (Wright): I was in the house on Friday afternoon when the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains delivered his speech and I can swear that the words which he used in French are the

[Mr. Homuth.]

exact words that appear in *Hansard*. At that time I wanted to ask the hon. member the names of the ministers, but it happened that there was a French minister sitting in his seat and I thought he would interrupt the member for Laval-Two Mountains and ask him what the names were. I cannot accept the withdrawal which the hon. member made a few minutes ago, because he declared, in withdrawing his statement, that he was willing to withdraw in order to save this country money and to save time as well. If therefore his withdrawal is accepted by the house he will be in a position to go outside this parliament and say that if he had not wanted to save the country time and money he could have proven his accusation.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It seems to me that the hon. member withdrew without qualification the second time.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains has already spoken. We are not in committee.

Mr. VINCENT DUPUIS (Chambly-Rouville): I wish to say just a few words. I completely concur in the views of the right hon. the Prime Minister. The integrity of members of this national assembly must be kept sacred, and no member of the house has the right to say anything which would diminish the reputation of any other member. The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains made a very serious and grave charge, as Your Honour said. There may be circumstances which would not excuse, though they might explain, the language of a person, but in the criminal law it does not matter if a crime is committed while a man is not in possession of the well-balanced mind which otherwise he has. I am not here to defend the hon. gentleman, but I understand that in a case of slander, if a newspaper withdraws unconditionally what it has written there is no action in law against it and the matter is completely abandoned. The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains did withdraw. He said, however, that he withdrew because he did not want to have this parliament go to the expense of an investigation or an inquiry. If I understood the Prime Minister correctly, he said that unless the hon. gentleman withdrew unconditionally the accusation must be referred to the committee on privileges and elections. As we are not satisfied with the declaration of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains, is it not permissible—because we know his intent; he intends to withdraw—for Your Honour to draft a declaration which would be satisfactory