

there that they stole the money, they stole the goods, or the Criminal Code does not mean what it says, and does not mean anything. It used to be said the receiver was worse than the thief. As I understand the position to-day, a man who is an accomplice is guilty of the offence; and Mr. Lanctot was as clearly as a man could be an accomplice in the acts of these men.

Now I am told that he had agreed to pay it back again, and he did pay it back again. The offence was complete when he got the goods, and the fact that he paid for the goods afterwards does not alter the fact that he had committed the offence; and what may have been the idea in his mind as to what he was going to do, I submit we cannot safely take as having any bearing on the question. We are told that he was in dire necessity, there was not a painter in Sorel. Mr. Lanctot's house had to be painted. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) spent some time this afternoon in showing how completely the attempt had failed to prove that there were any painters in Sorel. A convenient doctrine. I need something for my house, I cannot get it in Montreal.

My hon. friend the member for Welland has it. My hon. friend the member for Welland has a most agreeable and obliging servant who is a friend of mine. What more natural, what more absolutely innocent, what more positively commendable? It puts me on a pedestal as a hero. Why of course I go to my hon. friend's servant and I say: You just give me this thing which your master owns and I do not, and I will give you another one by and by. That is precisely the position. Why should we waste time discussing whether there were painters in Sorel or not? It does not make a particle of difference to the fact that this man gave away government property. Are we to have every time-keeper and foreman painter—because Champagne a time-keeper and Pagé a foreman painter—throughout Canada in any department of this government empowered to sit in judgment on the relative necessities of the citizens of this country and give them what they want, whenever such employees are satisfied that they cannot get what they want anywhere else. It is difficult really, to have patience with pretensions of this kind, really difficult. Manifestly the pretended absence of painters in Sorel has no bearing on the question arising on the different reports of the committee, the question before us, namely, the question of how Mr. Lanctot got these goods. I fail to see how it is possible to describe the operation by which he was put in possession of these goods, and secured the payment of this money to these workmen by any other word than theft. If the English language has another word, I would

Mr. DOHERTY

be glad to employ it. The word 'borrow' is suggested, and might be used if you could borrow from a man what is not his own, and what he has no right to lend, own, and what he has no right to lend, and if he may lend that without stealing goods; if that is so then Mr. Lanctot borrowed it. If you cannot do that, Mr. Lanctot got the proceeds of the thefts of these men and there is no other way to describe it. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Justice declare that there was nothing unlawful in all this matter, because, forsooth, there was no violation in his opinion of section 14 of the Independence of Parliament Act. Besides the Independence of Parliament Act, there is the Criminal Code, and it makes a variety of things unlawful, amongst others, the appropriation of your neighbour's goods when you have no right to them. There is besides that a moral code which may be supposed to have some restraining influence over gentlemen worthy to be members of parliament, and so far as I understand the rules of that code, it likewise rather frowns upon the appropriating to yourself of the goods of other people when you have no right to them.

I need not waste time pointing out that Champagne's consent and Pagé's consent and Papineau's consent if it had been obtained did not bear upon the question in the slightest degree and that Mr. Lanctot knew that; but so far as it goes, even if we assume that Mr. Lanctot was in a state of ignorance I would be sorry to attribute to him, and did suppose that Papineau the superintendent sat there with jurisdiction to determine when he was entitled to give the goods of the government away, we have it clearly shown that Mr. Lanctot being told that that was the essential condition, never got the permission of Papineau. As throwing light upon this state of perfect good faith that is attributed to Mr. Lanctot, I think it is our duty not to pass over the circumstances with regard to the obtaining of that permission. He proved to us by his own testimony as conclusively justifying his taking the stuff without permission, that he went to see Papineau, and Papineau was not in, and he seems to have assumed that because Papineau was not in, that changed the whole nature of the situation with regard to the person who was entitled to control, even if we suppose that the superintendent had power to give these things away. He went immediately to Champagne and made his bargain with him, and it all had to be done in a hurry because he was going to Saranac that afternoon, and he had to catch a train. This was on the 29th of May, and the painting went on until the 21st of November, and we have it on the testimony of Mr. Lanctot himself that the only thing about which there was any hurry on the 28th or 29th of May, was