

pretense of a settlement. Four days after that, on the 6th, Mr. Lanctot was in Ottawa. He can hardly on the interval have made a settlement. And even if he had, was it right that he should say he had made a settlement long before the 30th of November? It is inconceivable he should have done that if he were trying to tell the truth.

—which account, the account Mr. Champagne had given you?—A. The account for material. I told him I thought the best plan would be to have the same quantities of material returned to the department. He was quite willing that I have that done for him.

Q. That was the last communication you had with him on that subject?—A. I do not recall any other.

Q. Well, in writing you, for instance, inclosing the cheque to pay for the mens' time did not he also tell you there would be an account for material, for paints? Did he say anything about that?—A. I do not think he said anything, but I knew it about the same time.

Q. Then you knew it from Mr. Champagne? Well then he agreed to return the materials to the department?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, how were the materials got?—A. About the same time—

That is, about the time the settlement was made—about the 12th December, I put it at:

—about that time there was the manager of the Mount Royal Paint and Varnish Company—

Q. Mr. Lamontagne?—A. Mr. Lamontagne happened to be in Sorel and as he was one of the men supplying material for the department at one time and another, I gave him a list of what we required; you see the list was according to that memoranda.

Q. The memoranda of Mr. Champagne? Exhibit No. 20?—A. Yes. Mr. Pagé, so that Mr. Lamontagne agreed to send the goods to the department, and I gave him my personal cheque.

Q. Have you any cheque with you, Mr. Papineau?—A. Yes. Then at the next—

Q. Will you exhibit your cheque?—A. Yes.

And the cheque is dated 12th of December, and the goods were charged on the 12th, and delivered, I think, on the 13th. So, I think I was making no mistake in saying that not only was there no payment but there was no settlement with Mr. Papineau when Mr. Lanctot wrote that letter. In the second place, the minister himself says that he would not have undertaken to say a word to Mr. Blondin, if that hon. gentleman had gone to him, about the lawfulness or unlawfulness of what had happened, what he would have told him was that the goods had been paid for. Well, of course, if that settled matters we would not be here this evening. But the whole point is that we do not settle an unlawful appropriation of goods by paying for them. This is what the minister says on the subject, I quote from the portion of his evidence

MR. DOHERTY

ence which bears on Mr. Blondin's conduct. The minister (Mr. Brodeur), is being examined by Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Well now, just one question: from the 22nd of November up to the 6th of March, did Mr. Blondin ever inquire from you directly or indirectly, verbally or in writing, personally or through outside parties, whether or not the labour had been paid as well as the material?

Question objected to, but the Chairman allows the question.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur.—No, he did not.

By the Chairman—

Q. Could he have ascertained by inquiry from you that Mr. Lanctot had paid for the labour that was done on his house and also had returned to the department the material which had been supplied to him for that purpose?—A. Yes, Mr. Blondin, being a member of parliament, and making an inquiry of that kind, I would be very glad, of course, to have given him the information which I had in my department concerning the matter.

By Mr. Laflamme—

Q. That is to say, you had on the 6th of March all the information required to inform the House generally—

We know the minister did not inform the House generally:

—as well as Mr. Blondin, that the material had not been fraudulently appropriated, robbed or stolen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But had been borrowed?—A. Immediately after I got that information, as I told you, I inquired from Mr. Lanctot, and later on from Mr. Papineau, and I was informed that the labour had been reimbursed, had been paid by Mr. Lanctot and that the material had been given back.

Now, if there is anything in that to satisfy one that the labour and material had been lawfully got, then Mr. Blondin should have withdrawn his charges. But to say material illegally got had been paid for or returned, leaves the charge exactly where it was.

By Mr. McDougall—

Q. As I understand, that would be a matter of opinion. You considered at that time the matter to be lawful and others may have considered it unlawful?—A. I do not speak of the lawfulness of the matter. I speak of the information which I had been given.

Q. The information which you had?—A. Yes.

Q. And the information which you had consisted of letters of Mr. Lanctot saying that the matter was all right, that he had borrowed the goods and had paid for them?—A. Yes. He told me that it was true that some men had worked on his house—

This also is important as showing that Mr. Lanctot—different from the impression of the hon. member for Welland—knew that these men were on the pay-lists.

—and were retained on the pay-list, but that he had had reimbursed the money.