

that there was any arrangement for a sale of these goods to Mr. Lanctot by any one on behalf of the government, and it would not have made the slightest difference if there had been. It would not have been the slightest infraction of either the spirit or the letter of our Independence of Parliament Act.

Now, with regard to the work, very much the same condition of things exists. The arrangement which was made was distinct that the men who did the work were to be paid, at Mr. Lanctot's cost the exact rate of wages they were receiving when in the government service; in other words, if a man worked one particular day at Mr. Lanctot's house, the wages of that day were to be paid by Mr. Lanctot. Mr. Lanctot evidently thought that he was expected to pay as the work proceeded. He said that he was perfectly willing to do so. He asked for an account over and over again, not only he, but also the government official states. It was more convenient to the official that he should not be rendering an account periodically. As the chairman of the committee explained, he said that he was afraid that if he took money from Mr. Lanctot he would be told by some of the workmen that he had, in fact, received more money than he was giving to them, and not wanting to put himself in that position, he kept his account in the matter until the whole thing was over, and then that account was rendered. I ask your attention, as bearing on the question of whether there was evil mind in this matter, to the circumstances of the way in which that account is made out. That account was sent to Mr. Lanctot by post on the 21st November last, and it is an account charging Mr. Lanctot with a certain amount of money in respect to these services as being due to the Marine and Fisheries of Canada: 'A. Lanctot, Esq., Dr. to Marine and Fisheries, Canada, Post office address, Sorel. On the face of the document it is presented as a government account. How does Mr. Lanctot deal with it? He pays it within twenty-four hours, and in what shape? He pays it by his cheque and he makes the cheque payable to 'Department of Marine, or Order.' Well, if this were a charge in an election trial I think every counsel in the court would be somewhat astonished to find a charge of corrupt practices or of the improper use of money for election purposes supported by evidence of the payment of that money by cheque, and the payee named in the cheque one of the public departments of the government of Canada. I think I may appeal to the experience of hon. gentlemen in that regard, whether or not they are members of the legal profession; I ask any man of ordinary acquaintance with business affairs whether or not it is the mark of fraud that a man pays his debt by cheque upon his

bank account, thus preserving the evidence for any one who chooses to search the manner in which that payment has been made. That circumstance is one which is entitled to have, at the hands of any one considering what conclusion ought to be reached in this case, its due and proper weight. I present it to the House simply as one of the circumstances in this matter, and I say, without delaying to labour the details of the evidence, what the chairman of the committee has said, that I have read this evidence with all the care in my power and I cannot see any question of any importance in it which has not been truthfully and correctly summed up in the report of the committee, the adoption of which has been moved by the chairman. Those are the undisputed facts of this case. You may insinuate what you please, you may make political charges as much as you care to, but you cannot change the sworn facts in this case, and these facts are truthfully and correctly summed up in the report which has been presented to this House.

I say no more about the facts in this case, except to repeat what I said a little while ago, that I am not discussing the case at the present time from the standpoint of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or from that of the conduct of the men in charge of that branch of the department which is established at Sorel. I submit respectfully to you, Sir, that to do that on this occasion is simply beclouding the issue, and is seeking to whip, over the shoulders of a member of this House, the government which he supports, and to treat this question as one of party politics rather than that which it truly is—a question of the right of this man to retain his position, and his seat among us. Upon that question I have no more to say in so far as the facts of the case are concerned. Mr. Lanctot paid the bill which was rendered to him, he paid it promptly, and he paid it openly. If that bill was less than it ought to have been, unless you show some collusion on Mr. Lanctot's part with the man who made out that bill, Mr. Lanctot is not to be condemned in the premises. Condemn the men who did wrong, if they have done wrong, but on this occasion I am not discussing their conduct. I say the question here is simply, whether or not we shall adopt the report of the committee. That committee has dealt only with the charges so far as Mr. Lanctot is concerned. If it had been an investigation of the department, or of the conduct of the officials of the department, it is very likely, to say the least of it, that a good deal more evidence would have been given than has been given, and very different considerations would have arisen. Upon the question which was referred to them, it was enough for them to say that, at any rate, whatever opinion