

Government. That is the manner in which they work.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Bryson has not said so, there is no such letter.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not say that there is any such letter, but the hon. gentleman will not tell me that Mr. Bryson did not say so.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). He never said so.

Mr. BOWELL. It is impossible to sustain the charge that any member of the Government ever made such a promise.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh! I see. The election is now won and the promises are repudiated. If the Minister of Militia had been in the county yesterday, and had made the statement which he just made, Mr. Murray would have been elected to-day and not Mr. Bryson. It is very well for gentlemen opposite to say that Mr. Bryson did not say so. Mr. Bryson stated on the platforms and from house to house: "I am not at liberty to give you particulars, but vote for me and you will have satisfaction, which you cannot have if you elect Mr. Murray." The hon. gentleman referred to the plundered treasury of a neighbouring province which had gone to help the Liberal party. I have only this to say in regard to this accusation. If the hon. gentleman can substantiate the charge he has now made, as my name has been more than once connected with these accusations, I say, let him bring up his charges against me and I will be the first man to move for a committee of the House to investigate them. I do not pretend to be a puritan. I do not pretend to be better than my fellowmen. I have my faults and my shortcomings, but I am no hypocrite, and my faults are not the faults on which I accuse my opponents. I fight a fair battle. I want to win upon fair grounds, and, if to obtain victory it is necessary to corrupt the people, I and my friends are willing to remain 25 years more in Opposition. It is very well for gentlemen to make vague charges as they have done. I repel those charges and hurl them back at them, unless they have the manliness to bring them before the House in such a way that they can be investigated.

Mr. OUMET. I do not intend to delay the House from going into Committee of Supply very long. I only intend to answer a few words of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, who has been kind enough to tell us that we have never dared to meet him on the hustings. I had the honour at the last bye-elections to meet my hon. friend on the hustings, and I know the means he adopted to win the electors, and especially the country electors, to his cause. He says he does not want any money. He may not want any money, because there is not a bad instinct in the people to which he does not appeal during an election. During that election did he not tell these people at St. Scholastique, in the County of Two Mountains, that they had to revolt against the city people, that it was a fight and a struggle between the farmers and the manufacturers, that these manufacturers were taking away all their money, and that they had to fight monopolies? Did he not tell them that he had to fight the cities just the same as he has done during discussion on the Redistribution Bill when, according to his liberal principles, he was refusing to the city people their proper share of representation?

Did he not tell them that the only reason why they could not sell their horses or their grain or their produce generally was that the Government refused to make an arrangement with the United States Government in order to allow them the benefit of the American market? Was that true or false? It was false. Was it the fault of the Government if the Americans refused us a market for our produce? I say no. Whenever there is a Liberal member on the hustings, his theme is always this. If you are poor to-day and obliged to work without benefit and have difficulties to meet, it is the fault of the Conservatives, because their policy is an anti-national policy, and it would be better for the country to be annexed to the United States than to continue to go on with this Government in power.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is what your Premier said when he signed the manifesto.

Mr. OUMET. We tell the people that every man is protected by this Government on their policy. We tell them to work and they will have the benefit of their work. If a man is a capitalist his money can be invested; if he is a manufacturer, he can have work; if he is an artisan, he can make a living; if he is a farmer, we are trying to get for him a remunerative and good market. During the last campaign we met the hon. gentleman everywhere, and everywhere he met with defeat. Now it has been stated that the Province of Quebec has been corrupted by this Government. This Government in my knowledge never spent any money in that province but what was for legitimate expenses. Hon. gentlemen might have tried to prove their statement before the courts. Did they try to prove it? How many of our friends fell victims? How many of our men were repudiated by the people? Every one was elected, and was elected on fair grounds. The only exception was in Richelieu, and what was the cause? The cause was this: That while they were charging this Government with not doing its duty in prosecuting the Connollys and Mr. McGreevy, these very men were preventing us from holding that constituency. We did our duty fearlessly and to our own detriment, and we paid the penalty; but the people have rewarded us since by continual victories. The hon. gentleman speaks of Pontiac. Well, there is a witness here, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), who says that the county was deceived by declarations on the part of the Liberal speakers that the bonus they now owe to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway ought to be paid by this Government. Well, these gentlemen are very much to be pitied. After they have made in Parliament the most solemn declarations that this Government ought, on no account, to assume that bonus, they dare go before the people of Pontiac and state just the contrary. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that these men believe that the country electors are a lot of fools, that there is not a particle of intelligence or honesty among them. They do not dare to go before the electors and tell them so to their faces, but they will stay here for four or five months at the public expense, talking to the *Hansard* and repeating their stale stories about corruption, and all that kind of thing. Why don't they go into L'Assomption? Why don't they go into Frontenac? Why don't they go into Pontiac? They tell the people in that county that this corrupt Government is spending money elsewhere, but