

Tupper, after having by telegram consulted Sir John Macdonald. As if that were not sufficient, the ministerial candidate for that division, Mr. Châteauvert, having on his right hand the Minister of Public Works, and on his left hand the Minister of Militia, both of whom were present, according to the paper, at a meeting where he was chosen as a candidate, spoke on the question of the bridge. I wish to call the attention of the House and of those two Ministers to this statement, and I want to know from them whether the statement is true or not. Mr. Châteauvert said :

"After having obtained from the Ottawa Government, through the influence of our Ministers, Sir H. Langevin and Sir A. Caron, the release of the million dollar debentures and a promise of assistance for the bridge between Quebec and Lévis, I should consider myself a bad citizen if I did not consent to come forward under circumstances so advantageous to the city."

There is the statement that, through the influence of the Ministers in question, Mr. Châteauvert had obtained a promise of assistance for the construction of that bridge, and, as I have already said, there can be no dispute of the correctness of the report of that speech, because it has been sent to all the electors of the division by Mr. Châteauvert himself. I have here a circular addressed to myself enclosing that speech, and in which Mr. Châteauvert states that this is a correct report of the remarks he made at this meeting which was attended by the two hon. Ministers I have referred to. Some time ago I put a question to the Government with respect to this speech. I asked the Government as to their intentions with regard to the bridge, and I asked the Ministers whether it was true that Mr. Châteauvert had made the speech and had obtained the promise. Here is the question I put :

"Whether it is true, as stated by Mr. Châteauvert, that he had secured from the Government the remission of the said million dollar debentures and a promise of aid for the said bridge? What is the nature of the aid so promised? When do the Government intend to introduce measures to carry out the remission of the said million dollar debentures and to assist in the construction of said bridge?"

Here is the answer that was given to these questions by the Minister of Public Works :

"The Government are not aware that the article in question was published in that paper (*Courrier du Canada*) but they do know that Mr. Châteauvert exerted himself very much about the remission of the million dollars and about the bridge in question. The Government will introduce a measure about the million dollar debentures, but the remainder of the question I cannot answer now."

The article referred to, was the article containing that promissory note of Mr. Châteauvert promising to his constituents the remission of the \$1,000,000 debentures and the assistance of the Government for the construction of the bridge. This is a very unsatisfactory answer; as a matter of fact, it is no answer at all to the principal portion of my question, and I am very much surprised that such an answer should be given by a Minister of the Crown. The principal part of my question was: whether it was true or not, as stated by Mr. Châteauvert in that speech, which was distributed broadcast all over the city of Quebec and especially in my division, that this promise was made to Mr. Châteauvert. That gentleman states, that through the influence of the two Ministers now sitting in their seats he obtained such a promise, and yet, one of the Ministers alluded to by Mr. Châteauvert was the very one who, I suppose, is charged by the

Government to give that answer to my question. The hon. Minister did not say anything on that subject in his reply, he did not say whether it was true or not that such a promise had been made, and I ask him again now, is it true or is it untrue? If it is untrue that the promise has been made to Mr. Châteauvert, then Mr. Châteauvert would be branded in Quebec as a liar, and I would regret it very much, because he is a respectable citizen. There is no two ways about it; if the Ministers now state that they made no such promise, then Mr. Châteauvert told a lie to the citizens of Quebec, and he tried to get the votes of the electors under false pretences through that lie. On the other hand, if it is true that such a promise was made by the Ministers to Mr. Châteauvert, we want to know it, and we want to know also whether they intend to redeem that promise made to him, and in what manner they do intend to redeem it. That is the object of the motion I now make. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this speech of Sir Charles Tupper in Quebec, and that this promise which was spread broadcast through the city of Quebec as having been made by the Government, were all intended to bribe the city. Mr. Châteauvert said he was not boasting when he said that he had obtained this promise from the Government, and I think that I may state without boasting that very few other constituencies could have resisted such bribes as these which were used in the city of Quebec. It is well known that only one division was carried by the Conservatives in Quebec. I want to know if the people of Quebec are going to get assistance for this bridge; we do not want to get it as a bribe, we want to get it as a matter of justice to our city, which has been so neglected by this Government, and if it is not just we do not ask for it. The people of Quebec want a grant in favour of the construction of the bridge to be given as a matter of justice and as nothing else. I will await the reply of the hon. Minister whose name was mentioned as having given that promise on the part of the Government, and I want to know in that reply whether such a promise was made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the full extent of the remarks which the hon. gentleman has just made in reference to two very important questions affecting Quebec. I thought possibly, from the remarks which I heard, that the answer to the question might be found in the information which the hon. gentleman has given to the House to-night. He said that, in so far as the bridge was concerned, that it was indicated that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway would find it to their interest to build that bridge, and I, for one, am prepared to agree with my hon. friend in this and to think that for once he has been practical and has viewed the question from the standpoint of commercial interests. I am well known in Quebec to have been an advocate of the building of that bridge from the time the subject was first brought before the public; and I believe it can only be built when the different railway interests so combine as to make it a commercial necessity. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to another question which is quite different from that of the bridge—the question of the \$1,000,000 of bonds which are still in the hands of the Government, and which different in-