

sonable that this conclusion should be arrived at upon an accumulation of a vast quantity of evidence that directed itself to no particular point or against no particular facts?

But it is not the late Minister of Public Works that we speak of; it is the man who occupies a position of trust and authority under the Crown. Hon. gentleman opposite themselves would like to—and may—occupy similar positions. They must put themselves in the position in which Mr. Rogers was placed; they must put themselves in the position of hon. gentlemen who are anxious to maintain the dignity and honour of this Parliament. Undoubtedly, had the conclusions of Mr. Justice Galt stood, Mr. Rogers would not have been considered a fit person to occupy office under the Crown and to sit in this House. The same considerations should obtain to-day as those which induced the House of Commons in days gone by, both in Great Britain and in Canada, to expel from its membership men who should not sit in it because they were not fit to do so. The considerations that sent Lynch from the Imperial Parliament and Riel from this Parliament on the motion of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, still prevail. It is still within the constitutional right of a member of this House to stand in his place and move the expulsion of a fellow member on the ground that he is unfit to sit in the House or to hold office under the Crown. The ex-Minister of Public Works was improperly and unfairly charged with offences which were not proven. I can readily understand, however, that the then commissioner might conclude that these charges were established, having regard to the criminal proceedings that were then being had against ex-ministers of the Crown and to the state of excited public opinion that had arisen because of wrong-doing in Manitoba. Mr. Justice Galt arrived, then, at conclusions with respect to Mr. Rogers and those conclusions have been determined to be without the support of a single scintilla of evidence or vestige of testimony. It seems to me that with a larger aspect and a wider view, hon. gentlemen opposite should look on this case not as the case of Mr. Rogers, not as the case of an individual, but as the case of a member of this House, a minister of the Crown, who is charged with offences which were not proven, with wrong-doing which was not established, with malfeasance and maladministration of which there was no evidence.

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

No man in this House, no speaker on a public platform, no newspaper has been so bold as to say that in the whole of the record of the proceedings before Mr. Justice Galt, there was a single line that pointed to the conclusions at which the commissioner arrived. That is a fact that should be kept in mind. Eminent lawyers, not associated with the party with which I have been associated, read the testimony with care, and not one of them has said that a single line of the evidence established the conclusions against Mr. Rogers. This House should be proud and glad that we have in power a Government willing to spend a few thousand dollars in order that one of our fellow members, one of the ministers of the Crown, holding a high office and enjoying a position in which he has the confidence of his Sovereign, should be given an opportunity before an unbiased tribunal, not to present new testimony, but to have the former testimony reconsidered. The commission appointed to review the findings of Mr. Justice Galt made it clear that upon the closest scrutiny and the most careful examination of the record, there was not a single word, a scintilla of testimony, upon which to base conclusions that were arrived at.

Mr. CARVELL: In view of the most remarkable statements made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) and by the member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) who is half in and half out with the Government—

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, he is all out.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to second the proposal made by the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and I do so with the very greatest sincerity. When the Government ask the people to pay \$5,500 to meet the expenses of reviewing the findings of Mr. Justice Galt on the ground that there was not a scintilla of evidence—to quote the expression used by the member for Calgary at least three or four times—to justify that finding, before I vote for the payment of this money I am going to demand a chance to investigate that matter and to discuss it in this House. I have persistently opposed the public investigation in the House of Commons, of the Hon. Mr. Rogers' affairs in Manitoba. We have passed through a session of six or seven months since these reports became public and from this side of the House not one word has been stated in reference to it, and there has been no condemnation of Mr. Rogers.