

public expense and to the public detriment by his position as member of the House.

Now, that appears to me to be a very serious charge made against an hon. member of this House, and before the House comes to the conclusion that the hon. member for Richelieu is to be condemned on a charge so serious, it seems to me that the evidence, and all the evidence taken, should be very carefully weighed and very fairly considered. On the day the charge was given utterance to in the House, Mr. Lanctot, the member for Richelieu, made a statement in which he said that in 1910, in consequence of the serious illness of Mrs. Lanctot, his wife, who was away at a health resort, it was necessary for him to be considerably away from home, and it was—I think he used the word 'impossible'—at any rate, he was unable to get painters in Sorel to paint his house, and he, therefore, spoke to Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé, who was foreman of the painters in the government yards at Sorel, to know if he could let him have the men to paint the house, and would look after the painting of the House. Mr. Pagé lived across the street from the building which Mr. Lanctot was having painted. Mr. Pagé told him that he would be glad to do it, the expression he used being 'with pleasure, if you can get the permission of Mr. Papineau' who was the director or superintendent of the government shipyard at Sorel. The men were permitted to go and work on Mr. Lanctot's house. Mr. Lanctot said that he had on different occasions asked to have an account of the men's time and the paint that was supplied sent to him so that he could from time to time pay the men's wages, but Mr. Champagne who was the timekeeper at the government yards, and who kept the time of the men, told him to wait until the work was all completed, and then he would send in a full account of the whole work, and it could be paid in one lump sum. I apprehend, if that is the true condition of affairs, that no person inside or outside this House will condemn Mr. Lanctot for having fraudulently, or with intention of fraud, used the employees of the government, or government material for the painting of his house. It is simply a question as to whether that statement is true or untrue, as to whether or not the evidence which was adduced before the committee bears out the statement of Mr. Lanctot.

In the first place, it is alleged that he could have procured men in Sorel to do the work and that it was not necessary for him to go to the government yard to secure employees to do it. The evidence on that particular point is not voluminous. There were only three witnesses called, and the first witness called was Mr. Henry Proulx, a contractor in Sorel. He makes the state-

Mr. GERMAN.

ment that there were four painting contractors in Sorel who could have done this work for Mr. Lanctot. His evidence will be found on page 48 of the printed evidence. But, he says this:

I do not know that they would have had the time to do the work.

So that his evidence as to that is more guesswork than anything else. He says that there are four painting contractors there who might have been got to do the work, but he does not know if they would have had the time. Of these four only two are called. A Mr. Georges Cartier, a painter is called, and Auguste Payette, a painter, is also called, two out of the four contractors whom Mr. Proulx said were able to do the work. Why the other two were not called I cannot understand because I may say that the committee gave every possible opportunity to the learned counsel, Mr. McDougall, who is a very able lawyer, evidently well accustomed to conduct a case of this nature, and well accustomed to conducting cases of any nature as he showed himself to be an expert cross-examiner, and an expert conductor of the case. But yet, he only calls two of these witnesses. What does Cartier say:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What page?

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Cartier's evidence will be found on pages 29-36. He says that in the month of November, 1909, almost a year before Mr. Lanctot's house was ready for the painter, he met Mr. Lanctot and asked him about doing the painting. He says that he asked for the job of painting the house and that Mr. Lanctot said he would not give the job without seeing him, but that he did not see him again. This was in November, prior to the July or August when the painting work began. Mr. Cartier, in his cross-examination, admits that during the year 1910 he was busy with other jobs of painting, that he had work to do. He went to the city of Montreal to do certain work, his time was occupied, and on cross-examination he had to admit that the painting work which he had done in Sorel had not been satisfactory to, at any rate, some of his customers. It was very evident from his own statement that he was not a man whom any person would be willing to trust with the responsibility of looking after work of that kind, particularly when the owner of the work and the man who wanted the work done would not be present himself. I think, therefore, that Mr. Cartier's evidence is not such as should impress the members of this House with the idea that he could have done the work, and done it with satisfaction. Mr. Augustin Payette gives his evidence at page 120, and he says that one evening in March, 1910, he met Mr. Lanc-