

also know how he gets broadened out after a while. Well, in England the view is the narrow view, not the broad view of the Dominion overseas.

Referring to our bountiful crop, Sir Herbert said that he did not think there would be any difficulty in getting bottoms—at least that could be arranged, while as for price, of course, it must be remembered that England could not get the wheat from Russia that she was in the habit of getting—at least, not yet, and that she would then turn to Canada.

As to the lowering of the rate of exchange, it was to be observed that that rate was enhanced yesterday. Had not the tag of the income tax been put upon the recent war loan, hundreds of millions would have been subscribed on this side and thus a proper credit would have been set up. However, the rate would right itself without much trouble.

I am reading this because it is worthy to be put down as the opinion of a prominent man and to defend the opinions of others who have just as much right as Mr. Holt has to put their views before the country. I repeat there has never been a word of blame from the Gazette, from the leader of the Government, from any Tory organizer, or from Sir Herbert Ames, of Montreal, the head of the Nationalist party in the election of 1911, for these expressions of Mr. Holt. Those are the facts. This is the position of this country as described by the men I am quoting from. The Daily Mail of London, England, contains articles just as strong as the words of Mr. Holt, and I can cite many English members of Parliament and Lords who spoke in the same strain.

I am afraid that the words of Lloyd George in the House of Commons a few weeks ago are too true, that the fateful words which had dogged the steps of the Allies were—"too late." It may be, perhaps, too late, but I hope not. I hope that with the help of those who are willing to sacrifice their lives by going into the trenches in Flanders we will come out all right, and those who have been criticising Quebec will have to take back a lot they have said about our people. In the Gazette of December 18 last I find a letter signed by one Mr. Peterson, who had the audacity—I use the word advisedly—although he had not protested against the interview published in the Gazette with Sir Herbert Holt—to say that Mr. Bourassa may be arrested for what he wrote. Perhaps Mr. Peterson was right in drawing attention to Mr. Bourassa—and perhaps Mr. Bourassa was wrong—I did not read what he said at the time—but I have never read anything from Mr. Bourassa's pen that was as viol-

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE.

ent as what Sir Herbert Holt had said. Mr. Peterson is supposed to be a friend of Mr. Holt, and must have dined with him some day in the week; but how is it that Mr. Peterson has never written that he may or ought to be arrested and never said a word about this interview? Yet Mr. Peterson writes a letter saying that Mr. Bourassa is guilty, I might say of treason, but he had not a word of blame for Mr. Holt, for Lord Northcliffe, for Mr. Carson, who is to a certain extent responsible for this war on account of the attitude he took? So I say that it would be unfair to blame Mr. Bourassa when he is not willing to blame Mr. Holt, who said ten times more. In quoting this interview with Mr. Holt I do not wish it to be understood that I consider it quite true. I know nothing of what Mr. Holt spoke about, but I use it to show how unfair it is to blame other men, especially Frenchmen, who may hold views not so exaggerated and not so violent as Mr. Holt's as published in the Gazette. Now in Ontario it is said that the French asking for their rights in that province are resorting to a sort of blackmail; that they will only enlist if their rights to their schools and their language in Ontario are protected. I have read that in a newspaper. Well, that is all bosh, if the expression is parliamentary. A contract is always an agreement between two parties, and one of the parties may say, do you wish me to do this for you? If so, you should be just, and first give me justice. What did we see in England when the question of Home Rule was before Parliament? Mr. Carson was prepared to bring on civil war to prevent home rule from passing.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Not prepared; he did it.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE—Buying guns from Germany and organizing to fight Home Rule.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—To fight the King.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE—To fight the King when the King was going to sign the Home Rule Bill. How is it that England did nothing on that occasion? How is it that General French was sent to command the troops and proved a failure there? French was the man who wrote letters to Carson saying that if civil war should break out the English troops would not be called upon to fire on Carson's men. He was surely one of those to whom Mr. Holt was alluding. But now there is another Bill