

'unlawfully' in the different branches of these conclusions to the minority report, if the hon. gentlemen who have signed that report thought themselves justified in using that word. I have tried to point out why, to my mind as a lawyer, it is perfectly clear, if any question of law can be clear, that there was nothing whatever unlawful about it. I should be certainly, as an advising solicitor, unable to give a client any other advice, if he were to be sued, under the provisions of the sections of the statute to which I have been referring, for the penalties that he would incur by sitting in this House if disqualified—I could not give him any other advice, I say, than that I have indicated, that he was perfectly free of any danger of the success of such an action in circumstances such as existed here. I am discussing it, in that view of the matter, purely and entirely from the dry legal standpoint; I am sure I am not misunderstood in that regard. I said at the outset that these facts might be viewed either from that standpoint, or as evidence of facts from which some one or other might, according to his political temperament, infer that there had been dishonest conduct, fraudulent conduct, if you like, on the part of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot), but dealing with it from the standpoint solely of the legal responsibility, it seems to me the law is too clear to admit of two opinions.

One other thing I wish to say with reference to this conclusion of the minority report which we are now asked to adopt. I was astonished when I read these conclusions and saw affixed to them the name of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He bears a name in this country of distinguished and honoured parentage. I had thought him a man of judicial temperament and a man who, however, strong his political feeling might be, would not put his name to a paper which suppressed the all important feature in this case, the feature which existed, to his knowledge as a member of the committee who heard the evidence, and which makes all the difference between the truth and that half truth which is wholly a lie. In this report I find these two hon. gentlemen stating as their conclusion, to this House, that Mr. Adelard Lanctot did unlawfully, &c., procure the payment of such labour by and out of the public moneys of the Dominion of Canada for his own purpose and benefit; and leaving the matter at that and making no mention of the fact that every cent of the public money of Canada which had been used in the payment for this labour had been repaid and replaced by Mr. Lanctot, so that the

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH.

treasury of this country did not lose one cent by the transaction.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

### After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (St. Anne, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that we were all most edified by the homily with which the Minister of Justice premised his most eloquent address of this afternoon. I am not quite certain that that homily was exceedingly necessary. It would perhaps not be unfair to suggest that the address that followed on it was rather of a nature to make one feel that the orator, as he rose, felt that he himself needed to be reminded of those very sound principles which he laid down as those which should be our guides in dealing with this question. In my very humble way, Mr. Speaker, I purpose trying to put into practice the doctrine which he so lucidly and so clearly and so forcibly set forth with regard to the frame of mind in which this House should approach the consideration of the question that is before us. I purpose doing that even though in the doing of it I shall find myself compelled to absolutely refrain from following the example which the Minister of Justice set us with regard to the manner in which this question should be approached and judged, I rise with as high a realizing sense as any man could have, of the gravity of the duty that lies this evening upon the conscience of each and every one of us. I have no protestations to make with regard to my partisanship or absence of partisanship—protestations are something that I am not very fond of, and they do not carry much weight. I am willing to let my conduct speak, and to stand or fall by the testimony that that conduct may afford as to whether I be or be not a partisan. I must however, do the justice to the Minister of Justice of saying, that to a very great extent indeed he did follow his own advice that we should not make campaign speeches. He was not able to preserve quite to the end, however—and I believe it is to those who persevere unto the end that the crown is to be given—but he made a very successful effort for a considerable part of the time to avoid making a campaign speech. He made a speech, however, the tone of which is much more familiar to my ears than that of a campaign speech; he treated us with that eloquence which characterizes him to the typical speech (of course done in its most perfect method), but after all to the typical speech of the counsel before a criminal court who stands