

From the Montreal 'Herald.'

A despatch of 'Le Canada' from Sherbrooke states that Mr. Ames, the chief organizer of the Borden force in the eastern townships, is sending large numbers of the 'Montreal Star' to English speaking voters in those counties and of 'Le Devoir' to the French speaking ones.

The 'Herald' has the best reasons for believing that the assertion, so far at least as 'Le Devoir' is concerned, is true.

In what position does this place the Conservative candidate in St. Antoine?

Mr. Borden and his party feign to ignore Monk and Bourassa. They are holding separate meetings. They have separate central committee rooms in Montreal. Messrs. Monk and Bourassa ride the anti-imperialist and anti-navy horse, while Messrs. Borden and Sifton claim to be desirous of saving the navy. The aim of both is transparent. It is to destroy Laurier. Their insincerity is easily detected without lifting the veil which hides their electoral operations. But when the veil is lifted what do we see? Mr. Ames the chief representative of Mr. Borden in Quebec English counties giving imperialistic and jingo literature to the English electors, and at the same time distributing to the French groups in those counties the Monk-Bourassa paper, Le Devoir, and paying with Borden campaign money for that circulation.

After commenting upon it the article reads:—

If Mr. Ames is prepared to deny that he has had part or partial knowledge or participation in helping to disseminate the paper which preaches such doctrines, we will willingly accept his denial.

But our information is to the effect that he cannot deny it.

The same affirmation was made on the floor of the House of Commons. I will not discuss at length the reasons which actuated the Conservative organization in using 'Le Devoir.' Thousands of copies of Mr. Bourassa's paper were daily circulated, and surely it was not to carry on the campaign against reciprocity, because 'Le Devoir' was in favour of reciprocity. It was disseminated throughout a number of counties in Quebec because it was against a navy and contribution and because it favoured an appeal to the people. This seemed to be popular and to sway a certain number of electors, and this means was resorted to to carry the election. It was successful. It carried the election, and it brought these gentlemen to power, but it did not give them a mandate. You cannot support two policies which are absolutely contradictory at the same time and then come before parliament and say that you have a man-

date. On the 5th of September, Mr. Bourassa said in his own paper:

You will be told 'but if Laurier is rejected, it is Borden who climbs to power, and Borden is worse than Laurier.'

I resisted Mr. Borden when he presented his cash contribution scheme, but, between Laurier and Borden, Monk stood up to ask the appeal to the people. At first 17 members only supported him, but after the victory of Drummond and Arthabaska the whole of the Conservative party voted with him.

I will not cite the opinion of Messrs. Pelletier, Nantel, Coderre or Monk. Their stands are similar. They are against a contribution and for a repeal of the Navy Act. This is the gospel preached with the knowledge of Mr. Borden himself. He stood on the platform when the English speaking Conservative candidates expressed themselves in favour of the same policy, and I say that when you deduct from the Conservative vote 133,000 votes, this policy is in a minority of 224,000, and when you have, besides, such a campaign carried on in the full light of day, it takes some courage, to say the least, on the part of the Prime Minister to come to parliament and state that he has a mandate on this question and also to hear my hon. friend affirm that it was one of the principal planks of the Conservative party to offer a contribution in the form of ships or money. Was it the plank of Messrs. Pelletier, Monk, Nantel or Coderre? We have them on record as protesting against contributions and stating that they would vote for an appeal to the people. In the other House, when twitted with bringing down this policy as a hybrid policy, the product of the marriage of the Conservatives and Nationalists, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, 'but look at the child; whom does he resemble? Who won?' The victory was an easy one, when every minister who had shammed nationalism, to win the election entered the cabinet without asking Mr. Borden what was his policy, what were his intentions, and swore allegiance to him. Who won? The victory was easy against Pelletier and Company, but I would ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce: is that the whole question? What about the offspring? What about the children? What about the voters who carried you into power? It seems to me they count for something. They represent tens of thous-