

from Nova Scotia should by a commission of inquiry be found guilty of malfeasance, the Government of the day should have the strength, the power and the courage to say: We will appoint a commission to determine whether or not the findings made were justified by the evidence, in order that the public life of our public men may not become the subject of attack by every man who wishes to throw mud from any quarter. The hon. Mr. Rogers, despite what may be said, had the courage to ask this Parliament to determine, by tribunal, whether—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT:—this Parliament, and this Government, in whose hands the honour of Parliament rests for the time being—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Heaven help this Parliament, then.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Well, I would rather trust a matter of this kind to a competent tribunal than leave it to the judgment of a partisan majority, as was the case with the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is prejudiced.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not prejudiced, merely biased. After all, those who occupy high office and discharge public trust must have an opportunity to have themselves vindicated if charges made against them are deemed to be unfounded. I believe that if the member for St. John had his way, he would rather that the charge preferred against him and the finding made should have been reviewed by a competent tribunal under the Inquiries Act than that his name and fame should rest entirely upon a partisan majority's view. Of course, in his case the evidence was so conclusive that no tribunal would ever change the original finding; but he would have liked to have the finding reviewed for the sake of history and his place in it. It is too bad that that matter must rest upon the judgment of a partisan majority rather than upon the judgment of justices who are sworn fairly to administer justice and law. Mr. Roger's case is safe in the finding of Sir Ezekiel McLeod and Mr. Justice Tellier, despite the fact that the member for Carleton says that the conclusions which the Commissioners reached are not such as any honest man could accept.

Mr. McKENZIE: What has the hon. gentleman to say about the fact that hon.

Mr. Rogers refused to submit any evidence before Mr. Justice Galt, after he was asked to do so?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is hardly the fact.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is on record.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was asked to appear in argument only after the evidence was in.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to express my sympathy with the Solicitor General in the fact that his estimates are being obstructed by the member for Calgary. He has spoken about almost everything under the sun except the matter which is immediately before the committee. The member for Calgary says that he has learned many things from me; there is one thing that he did not learn: to curtail his speeches in the House. Another thing he did not learn was to say the right thing in the right place. If my hon. friend ever did an injustice in his life to any friend he did it today to the ex-Minister of Public Works. He has brought into the consideration of this item the question whether the report of Mr. Justice Galt is sustained by the evidence. That was not an issue until the hon. gentleman rose in his place and made the very extraordinary speech which he delivered to the committee. He has put squarely before the committee the question whether the finding of Mr. Justice Galt was or was not justified by the evidence. My hon. friend, a prominent member of the House, a warm supporter of the Government, a gentleman occupying a position which many people thought would be second in importance only to that of the Prime Minister—Chairman of the National Service Board—eulogizes the finding of the McLeod-Tellier Commission and discredits the finding of Commissioner Galt. The member for Carleton, therefore, takes the right course in claiming the right to have a full discussion of the matter dealt with in this item.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is my hon. friend aware of the fact that the hon. member for Carleton (M. Carvell) raised the issue before I came into the Chamber?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Well, I heard a part of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: All that the hon. member for Carleton pointed out was, as I understand his argument, that there was no authority,