

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. GEOFFRION. If my hon. friend wants to know, I can get the name very soon and give it to him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I heard that my name had been mentioned, and if so I want to say that the statement is absolutely untrue and false.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). Apart altogether from the intent of the hon. member for Richelieu, of which I shall speak later, the facts in connection with this matter are few, simple, clear, admitted, and it is not easy to understand intelligent and honest men differing as to the conclusion in law that should be drawn from these facts. The Richelieu river runs in a northerly direction and empties into the St. Lawrence about 45 miles below Montreal. On the easterly side of its mouth is the city of Sorel, containing a population of about 10,000 people, and just opposite, on the westerly side of the river, are the government shipyards and storehouses. The river runs through the constituency represented by the hon. member for Richelieu, who lives in the city of Sorel. The principal officers of the shipyard are Mr. Papineau, who is director, Mr. Terreault, Oscar Champagne, time-keeper, and John Baptiste Pagé, foreman of painters. The hon. member for Richelieu was building a palatial residence on George street, in the city of Sorel, in the years 1909 and 1910. On or about the 29th of May, 1910—and at present I am only stating facts that are admitted all—Mr. Lanctot went over to St. Joseph de Sorel, and there saw Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé. He asked Mr. Pagé to send some painters over to this new house that he was building on George street in Sorel. Mr. Pagé told him he would have much pleasure in doing so if he would get the authority of Mr. Papineau, the director of the shipyard. Mr. Pagé says that Mr. Lanctot promised to see Mr. Papineau and get his authority. Mr. Lanctot admits that he never did see Mr. Papineau. That you will find in his evidence on page 19:

Q. Did that conversation take place on the 29th of May or sooner in the month of May?

—A. I cannot say so at present.

Q. Did you ever go to Mr. Papineau's after that to obtain his authorization?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never spoke to him of the matter?—A. No, sir. Mr. Papineau lives opposite my house, at about seventy-five feet from me.

So that on the 29th of May, Mr. Lanctot saw Mr. Pagé and Mr. Pagé told him he would send the painters if he got the authority of Mr. Papineau, he agreed to get the authorization of Mr. Papineau, and he never spoke to Mr. Papineau about it until the work was all completed in the latter part of November, although Mr. Papineau lived

Mr. GEOFFRION.

only 75 feet from him. He went and induced an inferior officer of the government, Mr. Pagé, to send workmen to paint his house; he knew that while these men were working at his house, extending from the 3rd of June till the latter part of November, between five and six months, the time that they were giving to his house was being charged up against the government, and he knew that the government was paying these men for the work they were doing upon his house. Now, what follows from that? It follows that he, in connection with Pagé and Champagne, defrauded the government out of money that was paid to these men while they were doing the work on his house. It is no answer at all to say that he agreed to pay the money back afterwards. It follows from these facts that he was guilty of conspiracy with these men to get from the government or the people of Canada the money that was paid to the men while they were working at his house. It follows further that that money was obtained from the people of Canada through this government by false pretenses of Mr. Lanctot and Mr. Pagé. Now, is that so? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries would tell you that he consented to the payment of this \$375, believing the pay-sheets that were sent to him from Sorel, representing that these men during these five months were working on government work. So that the minister was deceived and the money was obtained from the government by false pretenses. Therefore, I say that the hon. member for Richelieu was a party to defrauding the government; he was one of the conspirators for getting the money from the government; he was a party to getting that money from the government by false pretenses. And that is not all; he induced them to take from the government storehouse in St. Joseph de Sorel to his house on George street, in the city of Sorel, some \$80 worth of goods belonging to the government of this country. Now, those goods were not loaned. You cannot borrow a thing unless you return that identical thing. There was no intention of returning the thing. The property in it passed forever from the owners, the people of Canada or the government, to Mr. Lanctot's house. In this connection, I want to read a sentence or two from the third edition of James Crankshaw on the Criminal Code of Canada. At page 413, in considering the section of the code which was read by my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), section 347, he says:

Theft defined.—Theft or stealing is the act of fraudulently and without colour of right taking, or fraudulently and without colour of right converting to the use of any person, anything capable of being stolen, with intent,—

(a) to deprive the owner, or any person having any special property or interest there-