

I say then, that the hon. member for Richelieu knew that these painters who were working for him were being paid with the money of the people of Canada, and he knew that that result could only be produced by a falsification of the pay-list. But whether he knew there was a falsification or not, is immaterial; he did know that they were being paid with the money of the people. I want to say here and now that it does not make any difference, so far as the member for Richelieu is concerned, whether that money was being paid without the knowledge of Mr. Papineau or with the knowledge of Mr. Papineau; that it does not make any difference whether that money was being paid with or without the knowledge of the minister, because that money was not Mr. Papineau's money and was not the money of the minister, and was not the money of the government; and neither Mr. Papineau nor the minister had any more right, if they had known this, to pay that money out to paint Mr. Lanctot's house, than Mr. Champagne had. The only difference it makes is, who is the guilty man in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that is all. But Mr. Lanctot's position is absolutely the same, whoever it was that paid that money. Surely I am not to be told that Mr. Lanctot may have innocently supposed that Mr. Champagne had a right to do that; that he may have innocently supposed that Pagé had any such right; that Mr. Lanctot may have innocently supposed that the minister had that right. If the minister had been the man that Mr. Lanctot dealt with, the only difference would have been that it was the minister and Mr. Lanctot who had combined to steal from the people of Canada; that it all.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Supposing Mr. Lanctot had entered into a distinct arrangement with Mr. Champagne that the government officials were to be supplied to paint his house, that they were to be paid for by government money during the course of their work, and that he was to refund the money to the government; under those circumstances does my hon. friend think that Mr. Lanctot would be guilty of an offence?

Mr. DOHERTY. I certainly think he would be guilty of a legal offence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN. The Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am not discussing the Independence of Parliament Act, I am discussing the offences of which this hon. gentleman is accused, and I am somewhat pained to see the amusement created in the minds of some hon. gentlemen on the

other side of the House because I have suggested that if Mr. Lanctot went to Mr. Champagne and asked him to pay the money of the people of Canada to his workmen, because he, Mr. Lanctot, was going to pay him back again, Mr. Lanctot would have been guilty of an offence. If the laughter of the hon. members indicate their standard of what is right and wrong in the matter of dealing with other people's money, it is to be hoped that their views will not prevail in this House. Why, Sir, if I walked into a bank to-morrow and asked the teller behind the counter to go on and pay the bank's money out to my workmen and I would pay him by and by, and if the bank manager came down at the end of the week and found that young man short in his cash, I wonder whether that bank manager's standard would be that of the hon. gentlemen who laugh. I see my distinguished, and eloquent and eminent friend, the Crown prosecutor for the district of Montreal, sitting opposite and listening to me with an attention that is flattering. I wonder if he would hesitate to indict the young man whose cash was so found short for having embezzled the funds of his employer. Why, the thing seems to me, as it must seem to every normal mind with ordinary ideas of the difference between meum and tuum, as absolutely self evident. I do not know whether it is that hon. members who are so much amused, having been so long now in the enjoyment of all the benefits and advantages that come from being faithful supporters of the present administration, have come to have a somewhat confused notion about whose the tuum is when it is a question of the money of the people of Canada. Do they apply a different rule in that case? I say that Mr. Champagne, when he paid the money of the people to the men who worked on Mr. Lanctot's house, stole the money of the people of Canada, and I say that Mr. Lanctot knowingly took that money which belonged to the people. It may have been salve to his own conscience—I am not here to judge this matter in foro conscientiae; we are living in the outside world where we have to judge of mens' intentions by their actions—it may have been salve to his conscience that he had paid the money back again. But whether he got these goods rightfully or wrongfully, they were not his and he owed for them, or was bound to restore them, and if he got them wrongfully, that made a double debt. So I say that on the undisputed facts, these men, to the knowledge of Mr. Lanctot, stole the money of the people of Canada to pay Mr. Lanctot's workmen. Possibly he may not have realized that to do so they had to falsify the pay-list, that is a matter of minor interest. But the great fact stands