

under the Inquiries Act, for the issue of this commission, and he did not see why the country should be called upon to pay the expenses of it and particularly the fee of the counsel employed to assist the commissioners in arriving at a conclusion. The view I take of this matter is that we have no judgment of a court. The expression of opinion by Mr. Justice Galt is not a judgment of the court; neither is the expression of opinion by Chief Justice McLeod or ex-judge Tellier a judgment of a court. They are simply expressions of opinion by those gentlemen which will have no weight and which ought to have no weight either with the people of this country or with the members of this Parliament unless the evidence justifies either the one or the other. That is all. The one is the expression of opinion of two very worthy gentlemen, and the other is the expression of opinion of a gentleman who was appointed, on the recommendation of the ex-Minister of Public Works, to the very high office of judge because of his great ability and integrity, and presumably also because of his impartiality. We have one opinion one way and another opinion the other way. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) appealed to me as to whether or not Chief Justice McLeod could be suspected for a moment of coming to a wrong or improper conclusion or of dishonesty. I would be the last man in the world to suggest such a thing with regard to Chief Justice McLeod. He was long at the Bar of New Brunswick, he is a very eminent judge; he has discharged his judicial duties with great ability, and I have nothing to say against him personally. But the trouble in regard to the investigation that took place before those two gentlemen was that there was no counsel to represent the public—no counsel to represent the other side. I would not trust the Angel Gabriel to come to a proper conclusion in regard to a question unless both sides were fairly represented.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What side did Mr. Teed represent?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Teed—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Teed is one of the warmest Conservatives in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has that to do with the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Teed was no doubt employed because he was—

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. STEVENS: Because he was an honest man.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He was employed because it was felt he would aid the commissioners.

Mr. CROTHERS: Who employed him?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have no doubt the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) suggested his appointment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member forgets that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) stated that Mr. Teed was employed by Sir Ezekiel McLeod.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have no doubt he was suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a gentleman desirable to appoint for the purpose of aiding the commissioners. But you cannot have an investigation which can be depended upon unless you have both sides of the question fairly represented. Counsel was not present to represent the people and to sustain the view presented by Mr. Justice Galt, to see that all evidence which would have a bearing upon the correctness or otherwise of his opinion was fairly presented before the commission. You must have that in order to have a proper investigation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We appointed counsel to assist the commission. The commission was representing the people and no one else. Consequently counsel represented the people. If we were to appoint counsel on one side as against the other, then we would have to appoint counsel for Mr. Rogers. Mr. Rogers had his own counsel. Why did not the Government of Manitoba follow the same course?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not concerned with the Government of Manitoba. They appointed a commissioner who investigated the matter, and if there was not the fullest opportunity given to Mr. Rogers to be represented by counsel, then the commission was very greatly at fault.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You do not answer the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: After all, it is simply a question of the evidence. The matter is still for Parliament to deal with if it chooses to do so.

Mr. CROTHERS: I understand my hon. friend from St. John has known Chief Justice McLeod for a great number of years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know him, but I ask my hon. friend: Is Chief Justice