

these men were working for Mr. Lanctot. There is every evidence that so far as these men could they kept it from Mr. Papineau's knowledge. There is Mr. Papineau's own testimony that he never knew, and there is the testimony of the men who swore—testimony at which the hon. member for Welland sneers, but which stands there, and finds remarkable corroboration in the fact that Mr. Papineau did not know—that they were warned when they carried the paint from the Sorel yards to take a route that would enable them to avoid Mr. Papineau. Much has been made of the fact that Mr. Papineau lived opposite and that they had to pass in front of his house, but the hour at which they were carrying the paint would be the hour at which Mr. Papineau would be on his way from his house to the works, and they were told to take certain streets so that they would not meet him. It was not a question of their being seen from Mr. Papineau's house; it was a question of their not being seen by Mr. Papineau on the way, because they were loaded with paint and Mr. Papineau might have asked inconvenient questions. I can quite conceive that Mr. Papineau may have known that these particular men were working on Mr. Lanctot's house, and may have supposed it was under this custom we were told existed there, of men being really and genuinely lent to outside people. There may be something to be said about the desirability of that custom, but at all events it does not mean employing the money of Canada for other people's advantage, or giving the goods of Canada to other people. For my part, I believe that Mr. Lanctot knew—because he could not help knowing—that these goods were in the Sorel yards for the people of Canada and not for him, that these men were working in the Sorel yards and that the money paid them was to be paid for the work they did for the people of Canada and not for him. That he could not help knowing that. If he had gone in there and stolen a barrel of paint would he be able to defend himself by saying: I did not know it belonged to the people of Canada, I did not know whom it belonged to. And if he could not defend himself in such a case, he can no more defend himself now by saying he did not know that that paint was not the property of these men who gave it to him. The two things are absolutely on a parity. So that I say, that not only did he know but he was warned with regard to Mr. Papineau that without his permission, at all events, he could not have these things. And if we assume him to be ignorant enough to think that Mr. Papineau's permission would have helped him, he never moved a finger to get it; never did anything after that one afternoon when he went down and found that Mr. Papineau was not in. I do not want to draw any inference or make

Mr. DOHERTY

any insinuations, but I might be pardoned for saying that sometimes people do go calling and are not heart-broken when they are told that the person they go to call on is not in. At all events, this fact does stand out: that Mr. Lanctot succeeded very very much better in his mission, because Mr. Papineau was not there, for if Mr. Papineau had been there we have his own testimony that Mr. Lanctot would not have got this permission. On that branch of the case, to my mind, it is perfectly impossible to reach the conclusion of the majority of the committee that the hon. member for Richelieu was blameless in this matter; it is absolutely impossible unless you are prepared to say that a man may take what does not belong to him, and if he only pays for it afterwards it is all right. Unless you are prepared to say that every man who is prepared to pay for what he steals is entitled to steal. Mr. Lanctot cannot be acquitted in the way in which he has been acquitted by the majority of this committee. For my part I would be glad to take any charitable view that could possibly be taken of what has happened. I would be willing to make allowance for what may have been the habit in Sorel, but that is not proved and I do not want to affirm it. I must say that somewhat to my surprise Mr. Lanctot's counsel strenuously objected to proof that this kind of thing went on generally in Sorel. If I had been defending Mr. Lanctot—I am not now talking about what might have been the interest of the department or others—but if I had been defending Mr. Lanctot, I certainly would not have objected to that proof because it might at least have explained how he came to let himself slide into the idea that he could take these goods under the circumstances and not be guilty of any offence. That might have been in mitigation; that might have had to be considered when we came to deal with Mr. Lanctot's position from the point of view of any penalty that might be imposed. We are not at all concerned to-night in determining, I repeat, whether Mr. Lanctot ought to be expelled from this House or not; we are not determining whether there should be any penalty meted out to him, or what penalty should be so meted out to him, we are concerned simply with the question of fact: did he lawfully or unlawfully get these goods and that money, the property of the people of Canada. And, the verdict that is going to be sent out to this country if the majority of the House stands behind the Minister of Justice and finds there was nothing unlawful, is going to be an invitation to the public in general: Come on one and all; here we are, the government of Canada,