

judicial tribunal competent to review the findings of that court of inquiry appointed by a provincial legislature. Therefore, if there is to be a tribunal, it would have to be established by this House. There are only those two courses. The one is to permit a minister of the Crown, if he be such, or a member of this House, if he be such, to lie under the shadow of that finding without any appeal at all; to place him in the position of a man charged with theft or murder and to deny to him the right of the ordinary citizen of Canada. We could take that course, or we could take the only other course, namely, to establish a tribunal of the same nature as the one that found against him, but higher in status, and to submit to that tribunal for review and appeal what was submitted to the first.

I ask the members of this House to compare the wisdom of the two courses. Suppose we adopted the first course. Is it fair, honourable or just? Is it fundamentally right or sound? We are told that it does not concern this House; that it does not concern the public affairs of Canada. I say that it vitally and fatally concerns both. I know nothing that comes so clearly within the purview of the Inquiries Act which says that we may make an investigation into any matter that affects the good government of Canada. Who would suggest that the impugned honour of a minister of the Crown of Canada does not affect the good government of Canada? It fundamentally and vitally affects it. No one in the world can compare the two courses. The one permits him to sit in this House of Commons as a minister of the Crown, while his honour is under the shadow of a finding of a tribunal appointed by a legislature or by a government of a province. Is that a right state of affairs? Is it just or fair? The other is the only course open—to seek to appoint a tribunal that will better command the confidence of the people than would the first tribunal, to submit the facts fairly to it and to ask it for a finding. It is suggested by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) that this tribunal was appointed to whitewash and that, pursuant to its appointment, it whitewashed the former Minister of Public Works. I do not think my hon. friend should make that statement. I do not appeal against the statement acting particularly for the ex-Minister of Public Works, but I do appeal against the statement standing by the honour and reputation of the eminent justices who reviewed the findings. I do not

[Mr. Meighen.]

think there has been anything in the public career, in the judicial reputation, of Sir Ezekiel McLeod or Mr. Justice Tellier, that would justify any citizen of Canada—not to say, any hon. member of the House of Commons—to attribute to them the character of being whitewashers of public men. I do not think the chief justice of his own province will thank the hon. member for Carleton for describing him before the people of Canada as a tool of this or any other Government, or as a whitewasher of public men of any party, or as anything but an honourable and reputable judge.

It was stated, when this commission was appointed, that neither of the members of it was known to the hon. Mr. Rogers at all; that he had never so much as seen either of them. They were appointed solely because of their eminence on the Bench, and because upon inquiry they were found willing to undertake the work, and because of their disinterestedness in this particular matter, for they could not possibly be said to be swayed by any of the provincial partisan activities in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They could not be influenced by what the judge called the "atmosphere".

Mr. MEIGHEN: By what was described by the trial judge as the "atmosphere" of the case. That was why they were appointed.

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never saw Chief Justice McLeod or Mr. Justice Tellier in my life. I had heard of them both, and believed they were honourable and able judges. That was all that concerned me, and I think that is all that concerned any member of the Government. I should like to know who could have been selected from the Bench of Canada who would be described as able judges fit to review the evidence, if not the men selected. Who would not be described as whitewashers, if these men are to be described as whitewashers? The only alternative was to ignore the finding of Mr. Justice Galt altogether, and allow a minister of the Crown of Canada to rest in a position inferior in matter of right to that of the commonest thief or murderer in this country. Every man is entitled to an appeal. The humblest citizen of this country, of any class or race, if he contends that no evidence was submitted to substantiate the finding of the judge or jury, is entitled to an appeal from any court in the land. And upon what