

fraudulently. Pagé has no right to use these articles other than for the work of the people of Canada. He handed them over absolutely without right to Mr. Lanctot and so deprived the people of Canada of these goods. I wonder how one of these hon. gentlemen opposite would feel if he went home some evening and found that some servant of his had given away—what shall I say?—these gentlemen are so devoted to harmony, let us say, the grand piano. The servant had got a solemn promise from the gentleman to whom he gave it, that he would bring it back again, or would give the hon. gentleman another piano. I wonder how long it would be before there would be a policeman in the house to deal with the servant who had—in such complete absence of fraud—given away the piano of the hon. gentleman. Why, the thing does not stand a moment's consideration. I give away another man's property, I turn it over from the purpose for which he entrusted it to me and give it to another person, and I have not acted fraudulently?

And now, with regard to the payment of the men—and that is a thing upon which I venture to correct a statement, in regard to the evidence of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). That hon. gentleman seems to have gathered from the evidence with regard to these men, that Mr. Lanctot went on throughout this transaction under the supposition that he was dealing with Mr. Champagne, and would have to pay Mr. Champagne, and that he did not know that the money of the government of Canada was being procured and paid over to these men. Now, the very evidence that the hon. member (Mr. German), cites as establishing the point, really shows that the hon. member for Richelieu could not have the very slightest notion of it. I am willing to take the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Lanctot), that, at the outset, that is what he meant—that he meant to pay the money to Champagne, and Champagne to pay it to the men. But that was never carried out and the evidence shows that he knew who was paying them. He tells us he offered to pay to Champagne. And what did Champagne tell him. He said: 'don't give the money to me for the men will think I am not giving all that I get; I don't want the money to go through my hands at all.' And the hon. member for Richelieu, notwithstanding his desire to pay, acquiesced in that. And this thing went on for four or five months. Does anybody suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lanctot), thought the men were not being paid at all? He knew he was not furnishing the money. He knew the money was not going through the hands of Champagne, be-

Mr. DOHERTY.

cause Champagne absolutely refused to pay the men himself, and take the money from Lanctot, because, as he said—I am taking these versions to be true—the men will think I get more than I am paying. The hon. gentleman knew that the men were being paid and that Champagne was not paying them, and that he himself was not paying them. And the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), would ask us to believe that he (Mr. Lanctot), did not know that the government of Canada was paying. But we need not indeed we must not use any inferences—though inferences sometimes are as conclusive as any proof imaginable—for we have been warned by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), that any inferences that we draw will necessarily be inspired by our partisan feeling, so, we will be careful not to draw inferences but will take the testimony of the hon. member for Richelieu himself, as to whom he was dealing with. Here is the wind up of his testimony :

Q. How did you come to send this cheque to Mr. Papineau when you had arranged about this matter with Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé?—A. Because the account that was sent to me was made in the name of the Marine and Fisheries Department, Ottawa, and was made: 'A Lanctot Dr. to the Marine and Fisheries Department of Canada, Sorel.'

Q. Was it the first time at that date, November 21, 1910, you learned that you were doing business with the Marine and Fisheries Department for the painting of your house?

—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know from the beginning that you were doing business for the Department of Marine?—

No doubt that means 'with' the Department of Marine.

—A. Certainly. I knew that the men of the Department of Marine were working at my place, but not Mr. Champagne's men.

I think the hon. member for Welland himself, will correct his impression on that subject. The hon. member for Richelieu knew as well then as he knows now that these men were being paid with the moneys of the people of Canada, and, unless we assume that the hon. member for Richelieu is absolutely bereft of ordinary intelligence—and I am sure my hon. friends opposite would not ask us to make such an assumption as that—he knew that these moneys were not paid to these men unless they figured on the pay-lists of the government of Canada. And to tell us now that he is absolutely innocent in regard to the means resorted to to get that money, to tell us that Champagne was the bad man in that connection, that all the benefit was going to the hon. member for Richelieu and all the guilt was on the head of Champagne, why, it is childish, perfectly childish.