

# THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

VOL. V. No. 8.

OTTAWA, APRIL, 1918

TWO CENTS

## QUEBEC RIOTS

On Friday April 5 th. on a motion moved by Mr. J. A. Currie Conservative M. P. for Simcoe North Ont. the question of the rioting, and disturbance in Quebec was discussed in the House of Commons. We quote herewith an extract from the speech delivered by Mr. Currie.

We also give a verbatim report of the speech delivered by the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier on this occasion.

Mr. Currie Stated:

I now wish to discuss the matter of who is to blame for this state of affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: I will take my friends first. I believe—I have the evidence right here—that the Government, in trying to enforce this Act with caution and moderation in the province of Quebec, have given aid and comfort to those men who are doing everything in their power to create a disturbance in that province. We all know that the man who is the prominent figure in all this anti-British trouble in Quebec is the editor of the newspaper called *Le Devoir*, Henri Bourassa. When the war broke out Mr. Bourassa was in Belgium or Strassburg, or some place over there, and he managed to sneak out under the protection of the British flag and escape to this country. No sooner had he reached this side than by some strange process he started to carry out the very policy which Bolo Pasha pursued from his headquarters in the United States as well as in France—that of creating trouble, causing dissatisfaction, doing everything in his power to prevent the people from sustaining our part in this war.

I say without reservation that he has constantly preached sedition in the columns of *Le Devoir*. During the troubles in this House over the passage of the Military Service Act, he was very silent because the public

mind was inflamed then, but at other times he has constantly preached sedition in his newspaper. Now, I can understand a patriot of the old school who fought for "liberty, equality and fraternity" preaching sedition against autocracy; I would do it myself, but that is not the case with this man. He does not want liberty, equality or fraternity; he wants reaction; his gospel is the gospel of reaction. I say further that he has commercialized sedition to sell his paper to the poor dupes who will read it; I repeat that that is his chief aim and object, and also to get a little popularity for himself. He is the leader of the Nationalist party. We on this side of the House had our trouble with the Nationalists when we were framing the Military Service Act; we know all about that trouble, but we are rid of them now, we hope. Why was not *Le Devoir* suppressed, and why was not Bourassa interned? At Sault Ste. Marie, Charles Smith, the editor of a paper there, a man whom I have known since he was a boy, the son of a respectable Methodist clergyman and a very respectable man himself, said something in his paper with reference to the manner in which voluntary recruiting was being carried on. At once his paper was suppressed, and he found himself penniless, and threatened with imprisonment. To my mind he was a much better man than Henri Bourassa. It is sometimes said that Bourassa may be more dangerous locked up than at large. The men who are the fathers or the sons or the brothers of the boys who went over Vimy Ridge are not afraid of

any cheap agitator in Quebec or anywhere else, whether locked up or free. In the United States men greater than Bourassa are being locked up and have disappeared from ken and will remain out of sight and unheard of until the war is over. But what do we find in the case of Bourassa? In this same paper with the heavy type about "Emeutes"—which I understand is the French for "riots" at all events it meant that when I was in France—are columns of Government advertising, whole pages of it. There is a three-column advertisement, for instance, on April 1st, signed by Charles J. Doherty, Minister of Justice; the minister no doubt will be able to explain that. On another page are three or four advertisements from the Public Works Department, and I am told that advertisements in connection with rural routes up in my riding have been inserted in *Le Devoir*. This is a serious matter. How can any French Canadian who reads the views of the editor of this paper escape the conclusion that as far as French Canadians are concerned, they are outside the war altogether, that *Le Devoir* has the Government approval and the Government does not intend to do anything towards conscripting them?

Now, I come to somebody else—Mr. Lavergne.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Colonel Lavergne.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not intend to call him colonel. Why has he been allowed to travel around Quebec with

(Continued on page 92)