

hon. member for Richelieu rose in his place and thanked the hon. member for Champlain for giving him an opportunity of disproving them, admitting in the most categorical way that there was ground for suspicion and that he was labouring under grave and serious suspicion which he had an interest to remove. I am not inventing that. You will find that in the very first statement of the hon. member for Richelieu:

I must say that I have no objection whatever to the motion of the hon. member for Champlain, asking that the charges preferred against me as a member of this House be referred for investigation to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am glad that he has brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I court the fullest and the most complete investigation of it.

Now, if the hon. member for Richelieu did not know that there was a *prima facie* case, and a strong *prima facie* case against him, would he have said that he was glad to have the charges brought forward and to have an investigation? But, more than that: the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sat in the House and heard these charges and this answer, and if he had then in his possession this information which was absolutely conclusive and which would have led the hon. member for Champlain to abandon his charges, did the hon. minister quite do his duty when he did not put that information before the House? I am not imputing to him that he did not do his duty, because I have no hesitation in saying that there is nothing in the evidence which the hon. minister laid before the committee which justifies the conclusion that if the hon. member for Champlain had gone to him and had heard what he had to say, he would have adopted a different course. The minister in giving his testimony was very careful, I think quite properly so, to express no opinion whatever on the lawfulness of what had been done. I would like to read that testimony because it is important in its bearing on this branch of the case. Now, this is what the hon. member for Champlain would have learned if he had gone to the hon. minister—I am not going to read it all. He would have learned, in the first place, that the hon. minister had a letter from the hon. member for Richelieu denying these charges. And just while we are passing, to show how conclusive a basis that would have been for the hon. member for Champlain to have accepted as a reason for abandoning these charges, let me point out that there is on the very face of that letter an absolute falsehood. We have had the conduct of the hon. member for Richelieu, since the charges were made, held up to us as a reason for concluding in his perfect inno-

Mr. DOHERTY

cence and yet, on the 6th December—and this is a part of the evidence that the majority of the committee think should cause my hon. friend from Champlain to withdraw his charges—the hon. member for Richelieu, in answer to a letter from the minister, calling his attention to the charges, writes:

Mr. Douaire states in his declaration that certain painters of the Department of Marine and Fisheries have worked at my house, and have been paid by said department. This is true; but as soon as their work was finished I reimbursed the department as per understanding with the officers.

So far so good.

I did the same with regard to borrowed material. The whole was paid several days before the filing of those documents.

These documents were dated on the 30th November. There was no settlement for the materials until the 12th December, six days after that letter was written in which the hon. member for Richelieu affirmed that the whole was paid several days before the making of the declaration.

Mr. GERMAN. Is it not fair to state that Mr. Lanctot had made an arrangement with Mr. Papineau that the materials were to be returned prior to the date you have mentioned?

Mr. DOHERTY. It would be fair to state it, but I think it would be a mistake.

Mr. GERMAN. No, that is right.

Mr. DOHERTY. I will just show the testimony of Mr. Lanctot himself as to when he made that arrangement.

Mr. GERMAN. There was not more than a day or two difference anyway.

Mr. DOHERTY. Before I go on to show that there was no settlement before this letter was written with regard to the materials, I want to point out that in any case it was absolutely untrue to say that the whole was paid for before the 30th November and before the declarations were made. That was absolutely untrue.

Mr. GERMAN. Well, it had been arranged for.

Mr. DOHERTY. To get right down to the question of whether, when that letter was written, there had been any settlement for the paint, let us take Mr. Lanctot's own testimony. If it shows me to be mistaken I shall acknowledge it most fairly and most unhesitatingly, because I have no desire to be unfair. The account dated December 12, 1910, will be found on page 24, of the evidence. I want to take the evidence verbatim so that there may be no question as to what Mr. Lanctot himself says about it.