

that the carpenters were engaged in putting the clapboards on the exterior, and there was some hurry to have a man put the priming on the boards before they got dry.—Let us say that that justified Mr. Lanctot in getting a man to go and hurry up the job. But how does that explain his refraining from any communication with Papineau throughout the whole summer and fall? It is quite true there were some weeks when Mr. Lanctot was absent from Sorel, but we have his testimony that he got back on the 20th of June and was there until the 20th of July. He came again in August, and he was there for quite a period of time and all this work was going on; in fact the contention is, when it is a question of showing that Mr. Douaire did not paint as many days as he said, that there was little work done in July and August, and that the bulk was done in the fall after Mr. Lanctot came home and Mr. Lanctot with his knowledge that he should have the permission of Mr. Papineau at all events, never went near Mr. Papineau in any way. The testimony of Mr. Papineau, whom we are all agreed, is an honest and reliable man, in reply to my own question is that if he had been asked to do this thing he would not have done it. He adds that no subordinate of his, of course, had power or right to do a thing that he had not the right to do. He does say—because I do not want to mis-state it, although I do not think it has any bearing—that there might conceivably be cases of such urgency and necessity as to induce him to send a man out for a day. But he says that under normal circumstances he would not have done it, and that he considered no subordinate of his had a right to do that which he himself had no right to do.

Mr. TALBOT. Is it not a fact that Mr. Papineau lives right across the street from where that house was being built, that every day he saw these men working there and knew they were in the employ of the government?

Mr. DOHERTY. It is absolutely a fact that Mr. Papineau lives just about opposite Mr. Lanctot's house, but it is also a fact that Papineau swears—I do not know if the hon. gentleman throws discredit on his testimony—that he did not know that this work was being done. I am perfectly free to say that it is a great pleasure once in a while to be able to agree with people with whom you generally disagree. I am quite willing to say it is a matter of surprise to myself that Mr. Papineau did not know. I cannot claim any very intimate personal acquaintance with Mr. Papineau, but I have heard from all sides, and I think the minister will bear it out, that Mr. Papineau is a truthful man and he swears that he did not know.

There is just one word I would like to offer which perhaps the member for Bellechasse may be willing to listen to, although he seems very incredulous, and it is that what Papineau did not know was that these men who were working there were working for the government and being paid by the government. The fact that they were usually government employees and were working on that house might be explained. I have no brief for Papineau and it is immaterial to me whether he knew or not, but I think it is right to be fair to every man, particularly to a man in whose honesty you have absolute confidence, when it is put in question by my hon. friend. There was a custom in Sorel of which Mr. Papineau did know; a custom under which it did happen that people came to the department and said: Would you lend me a man, and men were lent in a way with regard to which I see no reproach to make—a man was actually lent, that is to say, the department said to him: Go and work for Mr. So and So, and Mr. So and So will pay you and you will get your job when you come back, but in the meantime you won't be stamping on the clock and drawing your money from the government of the country.

Mr. TALBOT. If Mr. Papineau is the man whom my hon. friend believes he is, does he not think he would inquire how these men got there and why they were there?

Mr. DOHERTY. I do think that Mr. Papineau would have been entitled to more commendation if he had done so, although I do not recognize I have jurisdiction to pronounce upon Mr. Papineau's actions. It did strike me as extraordinary that Mr. Papineau did not concern himself more about the matter than he did, but it is fair to say that Mr. Papineau was not charged before us and was not offered an opportunity of giving an explanation, and I do not stand here to condemn him. I am trying to deal with the matter that is before us, and I am trying to be just to every one concerned. If the hon. member for Bellechasse thinks he has any interest in convicting Mr. Papineau of some offence, I can refer him to Mr. Papineau's superior, the Minister of Marine, who, no doubt, will accommodate the hon. member. But I do say that Mr. Papineau swears, and he is not contradicted, that he did not know this kind of thing was going on, that if he had been asked he would not have permitted it. And Messrs. Pagé and Champagne, who were carrying out this job for the member for Richelieu, were very careful to see that nothing happened that came to the knowledge of Mr. Papineau. Mr. Champagne even went the length of falsifying his pay-list with no other object than I can see than to conceal the fact that