

matter in the province of Quebec. I do not wish to create any more bad blood than exists; I simply say in good faith to my friends on the other side of the House, that it would be unfortunate if the Government attempted to pass the city over to the military authorities and not to use the civil authorities. Let the military and the civil authorities work together, and I make bold to say that there will be no further trouble in the city of Quebec.

### Law Must be obeyed, Property Respected, Peace Preserved.

Speaking with what authority I may have as representative of Quebec city and as holding the position which I now occupy, I can say that in Quebec the people are prepared to accept these three principles first, that the law must be obeyed; second, that property must be respected; third, that peace must be preserved.

### Henri Bourassa.

That is the spirit in which I intend to discuss this matter. Heaven is my witness that on this occasion I have no intention of endeavouring to create further difficulty or further trouble. What I want is what I have always wanted in this war—to help so far as I can to win the war. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) was kind enough to refer to some ideas which I expressed in the city of Quebec many years ago. These ideas, Sir, I have never departed from, not even in the position which I took in this House against the Conscription Bill. As my hon. friend was good enough to quote from a remark which I made in Quebec, he might have quoted also from my last speech which I delivered in that city, when I opened the campaign in the last election. Did I there say anything at all to which he can take exception? Did I encourage the people of Quebec not to respect the laws? On the contrary I said that the law must be respected, must be obeyed. My hon. friend asked me why I did not continue the course which I previously adopted; why I opposed the policy of conscription, and he linked my name with that of Mr. Bourassa. I see he is a close reader of Mr. Bourassa's paper. That being so, he must know that Bourassa is no longer a friend of mine; we parted company long ago, and we have never resumed it again. Let him read *Le Devoir* and he will see that ever since the beginning of the session Bourassa has been very severe on me. But I am not responsible for that. I follow my own course, whoever finds fault with it, or whoever approves; I am what I have always been.

### Armand Lavergne.

As to Mr. Lavergne. He was at one time a very close friend of mine, but we parted company also. Mr. Lavergne was a candidate in Montmagny in the last election, but the

young man who was elected in that county with my support, sits in this House to-day behind me. The views of Bourassa and Lavergne are not my views. The separation is not of to-day only; it goes back to the years 1910 and 1911, when I was opposed by Bourassa and his friends. And upon what ground? I took the stand that it was within the power of the Parliament of Canada to decree whether or not we should take part in the wars of Great Britain. Bourassa and Lavergne held that under no circumstances should we take part in the wars of Great Britain. For this difference of opinion I incurred their enmity, and they fought for the Conservative party; and my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) sitting there amongst the large majority in this House, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Bourassa.

He may ask me, why did I oppose the policy of conscription? I will answer him. I opposed the policy of conscription because I am a man of common sense; because I know human nature; because I know the conditions in this country. I knew that compulsory service would not bring the same results as the voluntary system. My hon. friend has alluded to the fact that the province of Quebec has not done as much as it should have done. I agree; I wish it had done more. But there is one way and one way only to deal with my fellow-countrymen. If you attempt to coerce them, they have too much of the Celtic blood not to resent it; but appeal to their heart and their imagination, and you will find them responsive. If that had been done, there would have been very different results.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Then why did not the hon. gentleman, as the representative of the French-Canadian race, speak to his French-Canadians in that way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did speak in that way to my French-Canadian countrymen. Let the hon. gentleman read my speech in the city of Quebec in the month of November last, and he will see if I did not speak in that way. My hon. friend may say that I have not succeeded as well as I might have done; I agree, but I have had to fight extremists at both ends, the jingoists at one end and the Nationalists at the other. The stand I always took on conscription—and I think I can appeal to the memory of those of my old friends who are now sitting on the opposite side of the House—was that under existing circumstances it would not produce the results that were expected of it. It is said that the voluntary system failed. Sir, if we compare what has been done under the voluntary system with what has been done under the compulsory system, I think it will be admitted that we could have obtained better results if we had persevered with the voluntary system. But I did not come prepared to discuss that question to-day; we may have another opportunity later on. I thought

that to-day we were going to discuss the riots in Quebec.

### British Statesmen Have Been Accused of Being Traitors.

My hon. friend has attacked the attitude of French-Canadians towards the war, and my own in particular, and I have this to say to him: On this question he and I are at the very antipodes; he is in favour of a policy that I am not in favour of. Sir, is this the first time that in a British Parliament a man has been branded as a traitor as I have been in the press during the last election and since? Is this the first time that a man standing in a British Parliament has taken a stand on his country's war which was not in accordance with the passions of the moment? I remember that during the South African War a young man of great promise in the British House of Commons took the position that England was in the wrong, and demanded that the war should be abandoned. He arraigned the Government for their policy, and was insulted in the House of Commons and in the streets and mobbed. On one occasion he escaped violence only by escaping from a meeting in the disguise of a policeman. That man to-day, Sir, is the Prime Minister of England, Lloyd George himself. Sir, the shame is not on Lloyd George for having followed the dictates of his conscience. But, his judgment was wrong. I believe—nay, I am sure—that England was right in that war. I stated so at the time, and I state so now; England perhaps was not free from fault, but, Sir, it was Kruger himself who drew up the insolent ultimatum that brought on the war. There was another occasion upon which one of the greatest men of the last century opposed the Government of the day in carrying on a war, and that man was John Bright. With all the splendour of his majestic eloquence he arraigned the Government for entering on a war that he said was senseless and causeless, and the judgment of the historian will be that John Bright was right, and that Lloyd George, on a later occasion, was wrong.

There is still another occasion which I might recall to the memory of my hon. friend. When the American colonies were goaded into insurrection by the British Government of that day, the great Earl of Chatham, who had done more for the glory and prosperity of England than any other man in many generations, came before the House with a resolution to the effect that the troops which the British Government had sent to fight the Americans should be recalled from America and endeavours be made to satisfy their grievances. What is the language of the historian upon this proposal?

It was in fact a proposal as startling and unexpected as that other very different one for an immediate war with Spain which he had sub-