

gone over all the evidence in that time—they may have glanced over it, but they could not possibly have had time to read all the evidence, all the exhibits, and everything like that. Then these two judges say, "We find differently." What weight can be attached to a finding under those circumstances? But I am not going to discuss that now. I should like to know on what reasoning this Government asks this country to pay \$5,500 to defray the expenses of this commission. I think I am correct in saying that when this commission was appointed some member of the Government informed the House that the commissioners were acting without salary. I know from personal knowledge that one of the commissioners was acting without salary. Where, then, does the \$5,500 come in? My hon. friend says that counsel was appointed. Counsel for whom? Counsel to assist the gentleman whose conduct was being investigated? No counsel was appointed for the country, because nothing was done; they did not call witnesses, except the gentleman whose conduct was being investigated, who, I understand, appeared before the commissioners and made a statement. No witnesses were called, and there was no argument. The public does not know what took place, or whom counsel represented, if it was not the gentleman whose conduct was under examination. Does the Government ask this country to pay \$5,500 to defray the expenses of counsel for the Hon. Mr. Rogers? That is about what it means. I know that one counsel who was there was not representing the gentleman whose conduct was being investigated; he was not there representing the people. I cannot reveal personal matters, but I will take the responsibility for saying that he was there simply to assist Mr. Justice McLeod. Now if Mr. Justice McLeod was receiving no salary, by what right does the Government appoint somebody else to go in and do his business?—because that is what it amounts to.

I have no objection whatever to the gentleman who received the salary. He is one of the best lawyers in Canada, and no doubt rendered valuable services. I hope he got a good fee out of it. (I may say that I adjourned legal actions in order to give him an opportunity to finish up this matter.) At the same time. I must seriously object to the people of Canada being called upon at this late date to reimburse the men who paid those fees. I think we ought to have a pretty clear explanation from the minister as to who employed these gentlemen,

[Mr. Carvell.]

how much they were receiving, the conditions of their employment, and generally, the reasons why the country is being called upon to pay the expenses of defending the gentlemen who were attacked.

Mr. CROTHERS: I would like to say a word in reply to the reference made by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a motion made in this House in May, 1909, asking the House in substance to express its disapproval of the conduct of the then Minister of Public Works as set forth in a report made by Judge Landry and two others. My right hon. friend repeated here to-day what he said a few weeks ago, that that motion was founded entirely upon the report, and that there was no reference whatever to the evidence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS: My right hon. friend is quite mistaken in that. Speaking on this subject a few weeks ago, he quoted some remarks I made at the time I had the honour, or otherwise of launching the motion. It is quite true as he quoted the remarks I made then, that I took the position that there was a report of this tribunal very solemnly constituted, as my right hon. friend will remember.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very solemnly constituted.

Mr. CROTHERS: Very solemnly constituted, by a special Act of the legislature. I took the position that so long as that report stood we were warranted in concluding it was right, and that if there was any objection to it it was the duty of the person chiefly involved to take steps to have it set aside.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How could that be done?

Mr. CROTHERS: I was just going to refer to that. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) took the position then that he knew how it could be done, and he told us he had already taken steps before the courts to have it done. He told us that he had already issued a writ in the courts of New Brunswick asking for certain accounting which would bring before the courts the whole matter that was investigated by that commission. I am advised, however, that he never went any further than issuing the writ. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was quite right in citing some remarks I made on that occasion, but he is quite wrong when he says the