

it is not unreasonable considering the work done.

Let me repeat that this money is not for the purpose of paying the expenses of counsel for Mr. Rogers at all. This man was counsel for the commission, and counsel for the people of Canada. He alone is being paid. Whatever counsel Mr. Rogers had, he paid for himself. I do not know that that course would be pursued by every other public man in this country. I do not know but that Mr. Rogers might have been justified, seeing that his honour was entirely vindicated by that tribunal, and seeing that the expenses he was put to were proven to be expenses to which he should not have been put, in submitting his bill of expenses to Parliament. But he has not done so; he has paid his bill himself.

Mr. CARVELL: I rather expected that my hon. friend would attempt to show that I was trying to vilify the Chief Justice of New Brunswick. As to that, I have nothing to say. The Chief Justice and I have known one another for a long time, and we get along all right, and therefore I do not propose to enter into any discussion of that branch of the case. But I want to say this: That knowing the Chief Justice of New Brunswick as well as I do, knowing his abilities, and knowing the abilities and relationship to him of the gentleman who was selected as his counsel, I have no hesitation in saying that if the people of this country had been represented, or if Mr. Justice Galt had been represented—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Justice Galt was asked by the commission to appear or to be represented, but he refused, and so did the Government of Manitoba.

Mr. CARVELL: And rightly so. I say that if any of them had been represented they would not have got the finding they did get from the Chief Justice of New Brunswick.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is a prophecy, I suppose?

Mr. CARVELL: It is not a prophecy, because we cannot go over the case again. I am only saying that it would not have happened. The trouble is that the intention from the beginning must have been to obtain the finding that was obtained, and every means was taken which human ingenuity could suggest to obtain that finding, and every means was taken to prevent any other finding from being arrived at.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did the province of Manitoba refuse to be represented?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know. I only ask why on earth did not this Government appoint somebody to represent the other side?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did.

Mr. CARVELL: Who was it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Teed was appointed by the commissioners.

Mr. CARVELL: I happen to know better than that. Mr. Teed was appointed to assist Mr. Justice McLeod in making his findings. I know what I am talking about; as a rule I do not make statements in Parliament that I cannot back up. Mr. Teed was not appointed to bring out the facts of the case at all, he was appointed to assist Mr. Justice McLeod. What I find fault with is that the Government did not appoint somebody to take the other side and to argue the matter. There was no argument; there was nothing put before the Commissioners except one side of the case. Mr. Lacoste, a very prominent lawyer of Montreal, or Mr. Montgomery, another prominent lawyer acted for Mr. Rogers. Mr. Teed was there assisting the Chief Justice of New Brunswick. There was nobody to represent the other side of the case. There was nothing said at all in the way of putting the case before the commissioners from the point of view of the other side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say we should have employed counsel to present the case from the point of view of Mr. Justice Galt? If that be so we should have also appointed counsel to represent Hon. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. CARVELL: You should have appointed counsel to represent the public. What is the use of trying to cover it with narrow technicalities. Hon. Mr. Rogers was charged before a tribunal of the province of Manitoba with wrongdoing, and it was as serious a charge as was ever preferred against any public man in Canada. I agree with the position taken by the Solicitor General that, as long as that finding stood, Hon. Mr. Rogers was not properly a member of the Government, and I realize that something had to be done. At the request of Mr. Rogers a commission was appointed, but, the Government took no steps whatever in regard to ascertaining whether Mr. Justice Galt was justified in coming to his conclusions, but they took every means that could possibly have been conceived in order to prove that he was not justified in his