

conclusions. That is what I find fault with. If the other course had been taken, if those portions of the evidence which justified Mr. Justice Galt in his conclusions had been brought before the commission, if able counsel had been there to argue the matter, I know Mr. Justice McLeod well enough to know that he could not possibly have come to this conclusion. I have read the evidence, and I have some knowledge of what I am talking about. When I say I have read the evidence I do not mean that I have read the newspaper reports of it—I am speaking of the actual evidence. When a man says there is not a scintilla of evidence, I can only say he has not read the evidence. I say the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) has not read the evidence.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. member for Calgary read the evidence as it came out from time to time.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. member for Calgary never read the evidence, and if he had read the evidence he would not have made the statement that there was no evidence.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I read the evidence from day to day as it came out.

Mr. CARVELL: Newspaper reports of it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The newspapers published verbatim reports of it.

Mr. CARVELL: But, I read the actual evidence, and I state again, if this matter had been properly argued and if the facts had been properly marshalled, not improperly marshalled, there would not be such a finding made by Mr. Justice McLeod. However this is getting away from the argument I was making a while ago. While the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) attempted to get away from the position in which he found himself by the statement of the Minister of Labour and the member for Calgary he stated they were creating this commission as a matter of principle, and therefore, no matter what the result was, we should pay the bills. But he had to come back to the fact that this commission found there was no evidence upon which Mr. Justice Galt could make these findings. After having read the evidence I am so opposed to that, and my whole sense of justice so revolts against it that I, for one, must demand that this vote be not passed until we have a chance to discuss the evidence in the House, and give the people of the country an opportunity of

knowing whether they are justified in paying the bill.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Ever since a few misguided people concluded that the hon. member for Carleton had about him some semblance of statecraft, and might become an important individual in this country, he has arrogated to himself an importance he does not possess. He stands here this afternoon and coolly states to Parliament that he knows more than all the judges of Canada ever did know or ever will know. He tells us that when the court before which he has been accustomed to practise decides in his favour it is a good court, but when the conclusion it arrives at is not the one he would arrive at then the court is no good. He expects the people of Canada to take him seriously. He has become minister of war, or would become so in the near future.

Mr. CARVELL: That is more than the hon. member for Calgary could do, although he never tried anything so hard.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I desire to say to the hon. member for Carleton that that is not so. The hon. member for Calgary came into this House with a very distinct understanding as to what his position must be while he was here. Such a statement as that by my hon. friend cannot possibly be sustained. There is this to be said about my hon. friend, he has stood up in this House and told the people of Canada that he knows much more than the Chief Justice of the province of New Brunswick. What a beautiful spectacle for a member of the bar; what a beautiful spectacle for a member of this House; what a beautiful spectacle for any public man who wishes to be taken seriously, to stand here in his place in Parliament, and for the sake of a little cheap political notoriety, for the purpose of endeavouring to make capital against a man who is not present, for the purpose of casting reflection upon a man who is no longer a member of the Administration, to tell us that no honest man could have concluded with Mr. Justice McLeod and Mr. Justice Tellier that there was no evidence to support the finding. According to his story, Chief Justice McLeod is dishonest. My hon. friend charged him here this afternoon with being dishonest. Will the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) support that? Will he bear out the statement made by the hon. member for Carleton? My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) says that no honest man could have arrived at the conclusion arrived at