

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There has been in the press.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not our fault. We have refrained from discussing Mr. Rogers' position, and up to the present time we have decided to take that course. We believed, when Mr. Rogers resigned and quietly slipped out of the Government, that would probably be the end of the matter, and perhaps it was better to let him rest in peace. But if our friends want us to vote an amount of money—it is true it is not very large, but the principle is the same—to pay for a whitewashing report over Hon. Mr. Rogers on the ground that there was no evidence whatever to justify Mr. Commissioner Galt in making his findings, then I say that, before I vote for it, I am going to demand the right to discuss the evidence in the most public manner; and I think I can convince my hon. friend from Calgary that there is more than a scintilla of evidence, indeed, that there is a mountain of evidence, to justify Mr. Justice Galt in the report he made. In that case, this item should stand until we have an opportunity to discuss the matter, and we will then try to convince hon. gentlemen opposite who clapped their hands at the statements of the hon. member for Calgary, and some of whom have not read a line of the evidence, that there was ample evidence to justify Mr. Justice Galt in his findings. We will then discuss the matter and give the whole story, and show those hon. members and the people of Canada that there was no justification for reviewing that evidence. There was ample evidence on which to make a finding—so much evidence that no other finding could have been made than that made by Mr. Justice Galt. We, therefore, demand that this item stand until we have an opportunity to discuss the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Personally, I accept the findings of the last and highest tribunal on the subject, but it is not because that tribunal has found that there is no evidence to support the findings of the lower tribunal that we asked that this vote be passed.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what we are told by the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Calgary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Calgary said that there was no evidence, but he did not say that was why we asked that this vote be passed. We would have asked that this vote be passed if the findings of Mr. Justice Galt was justified, just the

same as if it was not. The position here is one of the outgrowths of the constitution of this country. We are not constituted, as Great Britain is, with a single Parliament; we are a federal Parliament, and we have nine provincial parliaments, all of which have plenary jurisdiction within their spheres. The consequence is that any provincial parliament may appoint a commission of inquiry, a semi-judicial commission, and that commission may investigate the conduct of a minister of the Crown of Canada, either while he is minister or before he became minister. They have power either way. That commission of inquiry may come out with a report which may reflect in the most grave and serious manner on the common honesty and honour of a minister of the Crown of this Dominion. That has been the case already in more instances than one in Canada. That being the case, and such a report coming out and being made a public report of a semi-judicial character, what is to be done by the Government of Canada and by the Parliament of Canada? Only two courses are open. The one course is to ignore it; to blind our eyes to it; to say that we have nothing to do with that report whatever; that we do not care what that semi-judicial judgment says; that it may declare that this man is a thief or a murderer, but that we have nothing to do with that report; that we pay no attention to it; that we do not care whether it blasts the reputation of this man throughout Canada or not; that we do not care whether it undermines his consequence or his influence as a minister of the Crown or not; that we turn our backs to it and shut our eyes to it, and let it go. We have another course. We may have an investigation; we may have a review, and if we have a review at all, we should have it before such a tribunal as would be looked upon by the country generally as being higher in status, more disinterested and more entitled to public confidence than the first. Unless we do that, we might as well not have a tribunal at all. That is the second and only other course, for the reason that there is no way of submitting the judgment of the first commission of inquiry to any court of the land. If we tried to bring it before a court of the land, we should immediately be told: This court of appeal has no jurisdiction; we can do nothing with the judgment of Mr. Justice Landry in New Brunswick; we can do nothing with the judgment of Mr. Justice Galt in Manitoba. There is no