

if in respect of the Hon. Mr. Rogers any members of the Liberal party were guilty of half the crimes that were engaged in to drive me from public life. I cannot for a moment conceive they would stoop so low as to try to drive a man from public life from a report which they knew to be false and try to accomplish their object before he could get an opportunity to read the evidence or present it to Parliament. I am content to-day with the fact that I was able to present the evidence to this House and have the matter discussed in the open light of day, and have the judgment of this Parliament, rather than simply have the opinion of gentlemen who had gone over the evidence in secret, who had been assisted by counsel employed by the Government and who had formed an opinion without any opportunity being offered to those who might desire to submit a different view.

However, the question is as to whether or not these fees should be paid. I do not think the Government had any right whatever to appoint this commission. I say nothing at all with regard to the innocence or guilt of the late Minister of Public Works. I should be very sorry indeed to condemn him unheard, and if the matter comes up in this House on the Galt report we ought to examine the evidence with the utmost care. We should not be guided by that report any more than we would be guided by the expression of any men of high standing. I say the same thing with regard to the McLeod-Tellier report. It is simply the opinion of two reputable gentlemen who have been chosen by this Government, and whose report has the advantage of having been prepared in secret and under the circumstances I have mentioned. I would not have risen to speak upon this matter at all had it not been for the reference made to the course which was followed with regard to myself in 1909.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the committee rises it seems to me that on the stand taken by the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for St. John there should be no objection to the item going through. As I understand it, they want a chance to discuss the McLeod-Tellier report.

Mr. CARVELL: I never asked for a chance to discuss the McLeod-Tellier report, and I have been persistently opposed to discussing the Galt report. I felt it was a matter that should not have been brought up here at all. I object, however, to the

[Mr. Pugsley.]

item being voted to-night in view of the attitude assumed by the Minister of Labour and to a great extent by the Solicitor General, that there was no evidence on which the Galt report could be sustained. Before the item is voted, I think there should be an opportunity of discussing the evidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman misrepresents me. I have not asked for this vote on the ground that there is no evidence to justify the Galt report. I distinctly took the other ground; I should ask for the vote just the same if the finding were the other way. I never assented to anything on my own responsibility. I simply say what the tribunal found. The hon. member for Carleton stated very clearly and rightly that the report of Mr. Justice Galt being out, it was impossible to proceed, and we know that the proper course was to have an investigation, and the minister step out in the meantime. That being so, that is all the reason there is for this item. If, by reason of anything that arose in this debate, hon. gentlemen opposite desire to discuss the McLeod-Tellier report, I will undertake that their right to do so will not be prejudiced by this item going through. But we are sincerely anxious to get on as rapidly as we can. I do not want to put my own inconvenience as too important before the committee, but I do not want to come back and have an afternoon or night spent on this item for the purpose of a discussion at which I do not need to be present. Is there any objection to the motion being withdrawn and the item passing, it being understood that if hon. gentlemen wish to discuss the McLeod-Tellier report, they will be given, I am pretty sure, by the Prime Minister, the right to do so. At all events, their right to do so will not be prejudiced by the item going through.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We can take a vote upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that there was an arrangement between the whips that there would be no division this afternoon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It could be declared carried on division.

Resolution agreed to on division.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.