

Blondin, Sevi, ny, Paquet, Rainville, Lesperance. One and all repeatedly endorse resolutions purporting to condemn the Naval Law and the no less nefarious policy of Mr. Borden."

MR. BORDEN TAKES THE PLUNGE.

After referring to the result of the Drummond-Arthabaska election, Mr. Bourassa continues:—

"The time had come, it seemed to us, to debate the question upon a wider sphere, and **we accordingly prepared an amendment to the motion in reply to the address. Mr. Monk laid it before the House on the 22nd of November, 1910.**

"This amendment called for popular 'vote on the government naval policy and the general question of the participation of Canada in Imperial armaments.'

"Mr. Borden moved a sub-amendment in which he reiterated the assurance of our devotion to the Empire, and censured the Government for its failure to consult the people upon the 'naval policy.'

"After his motion had been defeated by the combined votes of the Liberals and those of Messrs. Monk, Nantel, Blondin, Paquet, Lortie and Gilbert, **the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Borden) and all his followers, barring Mr. Foster and Col. Hughes, supported Mr. Monk's amendment.**

"By this vote the whole Conservative party shifted their position from the ground taken in February, 1910, on which occasion they had expressed the wish to confine the need for popular consultation upon a permanent policy only. They also disregarded the lines set forth in Mr. Borden's amendment, which suggested popular consultation upon "the" naval policy; besides binding themselves to the principle calling for a plebiscite on any measure of 'contribution to Imperial armaments.' **Mr. Borden had even gone so far as to approve of Mr. Monk's proposal of a plebiscite. Later, did he not countenance his word by calling into his cabinet three ministers elected upon the pledge that the existing naval law must be repealed, and that no other policy would be adopted unless previously endorsed by the people?**"

THE SECRET COMPACT.

Continuing his revelations, Mr. Bourassa says in *Le Devoir*, May 29th, 1913: "During the session of 1910-11 two **leaders of the Conservative party requested that I meet them at the house of a mutual friend of ours.**

"Here is an exact summary of the interview. The envoys opened as follows:—

"The Nationalists say they are fighting, as we do, the Liberal government, but their stand upon Reciprocity embarrasses us to a great extent. Were we to unite our efforts primarily against Reciprocity, **it is quite possible that an understanding, satisfactory to both parties, could be arrived at on the naval question** since we are one on the point of popular consultation. If you press the naval question in Quebec it may provoke a display of loyalism on the extremist wing of our party. If Reciprocity be but a subordinate issue with you, the difference between us might broaden still more, for the sole benefit of the Common foe. At