

**LOUIS
GEORGES
DESJARDINS**

ENGLAND, CANADA AND
THE GREAT WAR

Louis Desjardins
England, Canada
and the Great War

http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=24547580

England, Canada and the Great War:

Содержание

PREFACE	4
INTRODUCTION	11
CHAPTER I.	30
CHAPTER II.	34
CHAPTER III.	49
CHAPTER IV.	53
CHAPTER V.	56
CHAPTER VI.	58
CHAPTER VII.	62
CHAPTER VIII.	74
CHAPTER IX.	76
CHAPTER X.	79
CHAPTER XI.	82
CHAPTER XII.	85
CHAPTER XIII.	94
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	107

L. G. Desjardins England, Canada and the Great War

PREFACE

Even since the issue, last year, of my book: – "*L'Angleterre, Le Canada et la Grande Guerre*" – "*England, Canada and the Great War*" – a second edition of which I had to publish, a few weeks later, to meet the pressing demand of numerous readers – I have been repeatedly asked by influential citizens to publish an English edition of my work.

A delegate from Quebec to the National Unity – or Win-the-War – Convention, in Montreal, I had the pleasure of meeting a great many of the delegates from Toronto and all over the Dominion. Many of them insisted upon the publication of an English edition.

Having written that book for the express and patriotic purpose of proving the justice of the cause of the Allies in the Great War, and refuting Mr. Bourassa's false and dangerous theories, I realized that the citizens of Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, who strongly advised an English edition to be circulated in all the Provinces, appreciated the good it could make.

I consider it is my imperious duty to dedicate to my English speaking countrymen this volume containing all the substance matter of my French book, and the defense a truly loyal French Canadian has made of the sacred cause of Civilization and Liberty for the triumph of which the glorious Allied Nations have been so heroically fighting for the last four eventful years.

As I say, in the Introduction to this work, I first intended to write only an English resumé of my French book. But once at work writing down, the questions to consider were so important, and the replies to the Nationalist leader's inconceivable theories so numerous, that I had to double and more the pages I had thought would be sufficient for my purpose. I realized that many points, to be fully explained, required more comments and argumentation than I had at first supposed necessary.

Moreover, since writing my French book, most important events have taken place. To have the present English volume up to date, I had to consider recent history in its very latest developments, and reply to the Nationalist leader's last errors, which by no means were not the least. When once a man has run off the path of reason and sound public sense, he is sure to rush to most dangerous extremes, unless he has the moral courage to acknowledge that he was sadly mistaken.

I trust that the English speaking readers of this book, will not, for a single moment, suppose that I am actuated by the least ill-feeling against Mr. Bourassa personally, in the severe but just denunciation it was my plain duty to make of his deplorable

Nationalist campaign.

For many years past, I have ever been delighted in welcoming promising young men to the responsibilities of public life. I remember with a mixed feeling of pleasure and regret the occasion I first heard Mr. Bourassa, then a youth, addressing a very large public meeting held on the nomination day of the candidates to a pending bye-election for the House of Commons of Canada: Pleasure at the recollection of what I considered a fairly successful beginning of a political career; deep regret at the failure to justify the hopes of his compatriots and his friends through an uncontrollable ambition always sure to deter, even the best gifted, from the safe line of duty, well understood, and firmly, but modestly, performed.

Passion, aspiring and unbridled, is always a dangerous counsellor. Mr. Bourassa could have had a useful political life, if he had realized that public good cannot be well served by constant appeals to race prejudices, and by persevering efforts to achieve success by stirring up fanaticism.

The result of the unpatriotic course he has followed, against the advice of his best friends, has been to sow in our great and happy Dominion the seed of discord, of hatred, of racial conflicts.

Unfortunately, for the country, for his French Canadian compatriots, and for himself, he was deluded to the point of believing that the war would be his grand opportunity.

Instead of using his influence to promote the national unity

so essential under the trying circumstances with which Canada and the whole British Empire was suddenly confronted, he exerted himself to the utmost to prevail on his French Canadian countrymen to assume a decisive hostile stand to the noble cause which Britain had to fight for, in order to avenge the crime of the violation of Belgium's territory, to protect France from German cruel invasion, and to prevent Autocratic power from enslaving Humanity.

Such a misconception of a truly loyal man's part was most detrimental to the good of Canada's future, to the destinies of the French Canadians, and to the political standing of the publicist who was its willing victim.

And to-day he finds himself in this position that he has no other choice but that of pursuing, at all hazards, his unwholesome campaign against all things British, or, boldly retracing his steps, to go back on all he has said and written to support inadmissible views, vain ideas, and passionate prejudices.

The latter course would certainly be the best to follow in the interest of his country, of his French Canadian countrymen, and of his usefulness as a public man. But, however much to be regretted, he seems utterly unable to overcome the prejudices which have taken such deep root in his heart and mind.

Prejudice, constantly cultured, soon develops into blind fanaticism, closing the intellect to the light of sound logic, to the call of duty, to the clear comprehension of what is best to do to promote the public good.

However seriously guilty he may be, the public man, so swayed by a fanatical passion, is sure not to rally to the defense of the superior interests of his countrymen when they are threatened by a great misfortune.

I cannot help deploring that after giving good hopes of a life patriotically devoted to the increasing welfare of Canada, by doing his share in promoting the best feelings among his countrymen of all races, classes and creeds, one of my kin, really gifted to play a much better part, has been so sadly mistaken as to exhaust his activities in forcing his way to the leadership of a group of malcontents unable to overcome their racial antipathies and listen to reason, even when their country and the Empire to which they have sworn allegiance are destructively menaced.

He has nobody else to blame but himself for the failure of his political career, due to his misguided efforts in thwarting the happiness and prosperity which our great Dominion would certainly derive from the persevering union of all the citizens enjoying the blessings of her free British institutions, to work out her brilliant destinies by their intelligent labours, their hearted patriotism in peace times, and with their undaunted courage and their self-sacrificing devotion in war days.

After a somewhat prolonged spectacular display in the House of Commons, as member for the electoral division of Labelle, he felt instinctively that he had exhausted what he considered his usefulness, and was doomed to a dismal failure. He retired from the Dominion political arena, to try his luck in the

Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec. No wiser a man by experience, he challenged the Leader of the parliamentary majority to a truly duellist struggle on the floor of the House. He thrust at his opponent with the vigour of a combatant certain to conquer. All those who witnessed this encounter, must remember how completely overbearing confidence, proudly asserted, was overcome by calm and superior argumentative power, sound and clear political sense. True parliamentary eloquence easily brought to reason pedantic and bombastic oratory. The first throw —*le début*— went decidedly against the Nationalist leader. A beaten fighter from this very first day, he met with as complete a failure in the provincial political arena as he had done in the federal one. Wisely indeed, he retired from parliamentary life, after realizing that debating power cannot be acquired by demagogic speaking.

The Nationalist leader next limited his efforts to the tribune, to the public platform. All remember the time when he was periodically calling great popular meetings held in *Le Monument National*, Montreal, where he preached his Nationalist gospel with vehement talking. This new experiment could not last. It soon subsided. And the Nationalist leader is since addicted to pamphleteering of the worst kind as I will show in this book.

Deeply moved by the dangers of a most mischievous campaign, I considered it my bounded duty to do my utmost efforts to prove how utterly wrong were the views which those pursuing it with passionate energy wanted to prevail, and to show

the sad consequences it was sure to produce.

Having first addressed myself to my French Canadian compatriots to persuade them how much detrimental to their best future the Nationalist campaign was sure to be, I am to-day laying the case before my English speaking countrymen, at the urgent request of many of them, in order to fully acquaint them with the refutation I have made, to the best of my ability, of Mr. Bourassa's erroneous theories and wild charges against England and all those who patriotically support our mother country in the great struggle she has had to wage after doing all she possibly could to maintain the peace of the world.

I ardently desire that the reading of the following pages, will contribute to the restoration of harmony and good will, for a while endangered by the Nationalist campaign, in our wide Dominion, to whose happiness, prosperity and grandeur we, of both English and French origins, must devote our best energies and all the resources of our unwavering patriotism.

L. G. DESJARDINS.

Quebec, October 1st, 1918.

INTRODUCTION

Canada, as one of the most important component parts of the British Empire, is going through the crucial ordeal of the great crisis which will determine her destinies jointly with those of the whole world. Instantly put under the strain, four years ago, by the outrageous challenge of Germany to human civilization with the criminal purpose of universal domination, she was fully equal to her unbounded duty. Conscious of her sacred rights, she at once realized that the constitutional liberties which she enjoyed in the freest Empire of all times, could not be more patriotically exercised than for the defence of the sacred cause which united in a gigantic effort England, France and Russia, soon to receive the support of Italy. By an almost unanimous and enthusiastic decision she rallied to the flag around which all the Dependencies of the Empire gathered from the five continents. Never a more inspiring array of loyal subjects, owing allegiance to a Sovereignty, was witnessed in the wide world.

Through the trying days of four full years of the greatest war which ever saddened the life of the human race, Canada has nobly, gloriously, done her duty. Several hundred thousands of her devoted sons have rushed to the front to fight the battle of Liberty, of Right, of Civilization. Thousands of them have heroically given their lives for the triumph of the cause which, if finally triumphant, will brighten with freedom, prosperity,

human happiness and undying glory, the destinies of many generations.

The struggle is not over. The battle is not yet won. Victory is in sight but unfortunately still so far distant, that it is still calling forth the undaunted exertions of all those who have pledged their faith to rescue the world from the cruel thralldom of German militarism.

Two years ago, at the critical period which culminated in the undecided military operations which, though rendered illustrious by the glorious defence of Verdun, made it plain to the Allies that success would only be the reward of a much more prolonged effort of untold sacrifices, I undertook to write the book entitled in French: "*L'Angleterre, le Canada et la Grande Guerre.*"

Several of the most influential and widely circulated Newspapers of Montreal, Toronto and Quebec, have kindly published highly appreciative Reviews of the French Edition of my book, concluding with the request of the publication of an English Edition, which, they affirmed, would be conducive to the public good. I have received many letters and verbal demands to the same purpose.

It is my duty to answer to a call daily becoming more pressing. I now offer to the English reading public a condensed edition of my work, with the title "*England, Canada and the Great War.*" I concluded not to issue a complete English Edition of the French volume. Instead of translating my book, I considered it more advisable to write an English synopsis of its contents.

Undertaking such a work, I realized more than ever how important it is for the Citizens of Canada to be able to speak and write the languages of the two great races of the Dominion. Knowing well my own deficiency in this regard, I hoped, however, to write the following pages with enough clearness to have my views well understood, trusting to the kindness of my readers to excuse the inadequacy of my command of English.

A few words explaining the reasons that prompted me to write the French book will, I am confident, be kindly appreciated by my readers. A close observer of the daily impressions which the events developed by the war were creating in Canada, I felt more and more deeply grieved at the persistent and unpatriotic efforts of the leaders of the Nationalist school of the Province of Quebec, and their henchmen, to sway my French-Canadian countrymen from the clear path of duty. I undertook earnestly to do my best to stem the threatening wave of disloyal sentiments and racial conflict they were stirring up throughout the land. "*England, Canada and the Great War*" was the result of the very careful study of the numerous questions therein considered and of the patriotic impulse which led me to publish it.

I dedicated the volume to my French-Canadian countrymen by a letter from which I translate the following:

"It would surely be vain to conceal how serious was the situation imposed upon our country by the sudden outbreak, in August, 1914, of the greatest war of all times. It was dominated by the supreme fact that Canada was a component part of

one of the most powerful Empires whose destinies were to be determined, for good or ill, for many long years, by the terrible conflict suddenly opened, but, for a prolonged period, prepared by those who dreamt of conquering the world."

"Great Britain, our Sovereign Metropolis, had done her utmost to protect Humanity against the misfortunes which endangered her future, for the maintenance of peace. She had failed in her noble efforts. At the very moment when, against all the most critical appearances, she was still hopeful, she had, all of a sudden, to face the terrible alternative, either to submit to national dishonour by complying with the violation of solemn treaties which bound her as much as Germany, or to unite with France and Russia to avenge Justice outrageously violated, sworn international Faith, Civilization perilously threatened."

"Could she hesitate for one single moment?"

"Our Mother Country has done that which her most imperious duty commanded her to do. She accepted the challenge of Germany with the patriotic determination inspired by the most sacred cause. All the loyal subjects of the British Crown have applauded her decision to rush to the defence of invaded Belgium and France, to reclaim their national honour and her own, and to protect her Empire against the German armies."

"With the most inspiring unanimity and admirable courage, all the British Colonies have rallied around the flag of their Sovereign Metropolis to share the glory of the triumph of Right and Justice. At the very front rank, Canada has nobly done her

duty. Her decision was most spontaneous and decisive. She was not deterred by fallacious subtleties, deduced from pretended conventions, out of age and opportunity, to hinder her laudable and patriotic course. Throughout the length and breadth of her vast territory, all minds shared the same view, all hearts were united and beating with the same powerful sentiment."

"The decision of Canada to participate in the present war was taken by the constitutional government of the country, sanctioned by Parliament, approved by public opinion, glorified by the hundreds of thousands of brave volunteers who courageously answered the call of duty."

"Views with which I cannot concur have been expressed and given full publicity. They challenge discussion. It is my undoubted right to criticize them."

"Since the beginning of the present war, Mr. Henri Bourassa, in addition to the daily publicity of his journal "*Le Devoir*", has developed, in two principal pamphlets, the theories of his "*Nationalism*". They are respectively entitled: "*Que devons-nous à l'Angleterre?*" "*What do we owe England?*" and: "*Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain*" "*Yesterday, To-day, To-morrow*"."

"In earnestly searching out the real causes of the war, the responsibilities of the belligerent nations, their respective aspirations, the duty imposed by the irresistible course of events upon the British Empire and consequently upon Canada, I was incessantly called upon to consider the very strange propositions contained in those pamphlets."

"It was with great surprise that I read, for instance, as the heading of one of the chapters, the utterly false proposition that: *"The Autonomous Colonies are Sovereign States."*

"And these most extraordinary affirmations that the *King of England has not the right to declare the State of war for Canada, without the assent of the Canadian Cabinet; that Canada could have participated in the present war as a Nation.*"

"It is my bounden duty to affirm that almost all the propositions contained in the two above mentioned pamphlets are wrong according to international law and to constitutional law, erroneous in their historical bearings, contrary to the true teachings of the past."

"Mr. Bourassa persistingly trying to convince his readers that the precedents of the Soudanese and the South-African wars have forced the British Colonies to participate in the present one, I considered it my duty to make, in two separate chapters, a special study of those military campaigns which, in both cases, were so felicitously terminated for all parties concerned."

"I cannot close this letter without expressing my profound regret that Mr. Bourassa has thought proper to use most injurious language adding outrage to the falsity of his opinions. At page 121 of his pamphlet: *"Yesterday, To-day, To-morrow"*, any one can read, no doubt with astonishment, that Mr. Bourassa charges our countrymen of the British races with being *ignorant, assuming, arrogant, dominating and rotten with mercantilism.*"

"Such ridiculous and insulting words to the address of our

countrymen of the three British races are surely not calculated to increase Canadian harmony."

"This book, written for the express purpose of assisting you to form for yourselves a sound opinion about the terrible events so rapidly developing, was inspired by my loyalty to the Empire whose faithful subject I glory to be, by my devotion to Canada and to my countrymen, by the affectionate recollection of France I will cherish to my last day.

"During the last fifty years, either as a private or as an officer of the Canadian Militia – my service as such having lasted more than forty years – as a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, and as a member of the House of Commons of Canada, I have often taken the oath of allegiance to the Sovereign of Great Britain. From my early youth, I had learned that under the ægis of the British Crown, the citizen of the Empire could be true to his oath, and enjoy the precious liberty of expressing his opinion. But I had also soon realized that during the lifetime of a Sovereign State, days of peril might occur. I had easily come to the conclusion that in those trying moments the loyal duty could be very happily reconciled with the most sincere love of political liberty.

"In defending with the most sincere conviction the sacred cause of the Allies, I am doing my duty as a free subject of the British Empire, as a citizen of Canada and of the Province of Quebec, as a son of France, as a devoted servant of Justice and Right. I am true to my oath."

I desire to call the special attention of my readers to the complete sense of the last paragraph just quoted. I most decidedly wish its meaning to be fully understood by all, as I intended to convey it to my French Canadian compatriots. I have never concurred in the subtle distinction so often made between the several notions entertained by many respecting their duty towards the Empire and Canada separately. Having witnessed, for the last fifty years, the admirable evolution and natural growth of the British constitutional system over a fourth of the globe, developing into the freest Empire that ever existed, my mind was more and more impressed with the conviction that loyalty to the Sovereignty presiding over such a magnificent national heritage could not be of two different kinds. A free British subject, whether living in the United Kingdom, or in any one of the Dependencies of the Crown, cannot be at once loyal to the Empire at large and disloyal to any of its component parts; or, *vice versa*, loyal to the particular section of the State where he is living and at the same disloyal to the Empire. Such a false conception of the duties of loyalty, if it could be spread successfully throughout the Empire, would undoubtedly lead to its rapid dissolution and complete destruction. Genuine loyalty cannot agree with exclusive and rampant sectionalism, with local, racial or religious prejudices and fanaticism.

The few lines of the preceding closing paragraph of my letter dedicating the French edition of my book as aforesaid, express my own conception of the true loyalty of a faithful subject of

the British Sovereignty, who has the clear vision of the meaning of his oath of allegiance. In consequence, first, I affirm my duty as a subject of the British Empire; second, as a citizen of Canada; third, as a citizen of my own Province of Quebec. And then, taking a wider range of the duty of any man towards his ancestors' lineage, I declare that under the cruel circumstances of the case, I also consider it is my duty to defend France against her deadly enemy. Further enlarging the vision of duty to its fullest extent, I say that I am bound to defend the cause of the Allies by proving that I am a loyal servant of Justice and Right.

Surely I could not emphasize in terms more pregnant my loyalty to the cause of the British Empire, of France, and their Allies, of Liberty and Civilization. I confidently hope they will persuade my readers that this book was written with the most sincere and patriotic desire to help rallying my French Canadian compatriots to the defence of the British, French and Canadian flags, which must together emerge triumphant from the gigantic fight against the most threatening wave of barbarism the world has ever had to contend with at the cost of so great and heroic sacrifices.

When the first French edition of this book was issued, in January of last year, matters respecting the prosecution of the war had not yet required the serious consideration by Parliament and the country of the question of conscription to maintain to their proper efficiency the Canadian divisions on the firing line. Consequently, I was not then called upon to consider that most

important subject. When I had to decide about publishing a second French edition – the first being entirely exhausted – I at first thought of adding to my work a few chapters respecting the most notable events developed by the gigantic struggle shaking the world to its very basic foundation. Foremost amongst them were the Russian sudden Revolution, the solemn entrance of the United States into the great fight, the imperious necessity of the military effort of the Allies far beyond that which had been foreseen, in order to achieve the final victory which will be the only adequate reward of their undaunted determination not to sheathe the sword before Germany will agree to restore peace upon the only possible conditions which will efficiently protect humanity from any other attempt at brutal universal domination. The question of conscription in Canada was the natural outcome of the progress of the deadly conflict between Civilization and barbarism, constitutional Freedom and despotism, democratic institutions and autocracy.

I soon realized that I could not properly do justice to such grave subjects in a few pages added to my first book. After mature consideration, I considered it was my duty to undertake to write a second volume. I have so informed the public in the *Advertisement* which prefaces the second French edition of the first. This second volume I will soon issue, also intending to publish an English synopsis of it, if that of the first volume meets the kind appreciation I hope of my English speaking countrymen.

However, pending the publication of the second volume, I

think it is my duty to express now my views, in a summary way, on that much discussed question of obligatory military service. Let me preface by saying that they are not new, having originated in my mind more than thirty years ago. The military necessities of the present war have, of course, given them more precision and clearness.

Deeply conscious of the sacred duty of all truly loyal British subjects through the present prolonged world crisis for the life or death of human Liberty, I had to consider conscription from the double stand-point of a free citizen of Canada and of my military experience acquired in the course of a service of over forty years.

Most strongly and convincingly opposed to the militarism of the atrocious German type – the curse of Humanity – I have always believed – and do still more and more believe – imbued, I hope, with the true sense and principles of democratic institutions, that the greatest boon that could be granted the world would be that the admirable Christian law of peace and goodwill amongst men would prevail for all times, and save the nations from the cruel obligation of keeping themselves constantly fully armed at the great cost of the best years of manhood, and of their accumulated treasures. But unfortunately it has not yet been the good luck of man to reach the goal of this most noble ambition. Instead of a steady advance in the right direction, he has, for the last fifty years, experienced a most dangerous set back by the predominating influence of German militarism, developed and mastered by the most autocratic power to the point of threatening

the liberties of the whole world.

Need I say that, as a purely philosophical question of principle, I most sincerely deplore that the political state of the world has been and is such that national safety cannot be, in too many cases, properly assured without the law of the land calling upon the manhood of a country to make the sacrifice of part of the best years of enthusiastic youth, and requiring from the nation, as a collective body, the expenditure, to an untold amount, for the purposes of defence, of the accumulated savings of hard work and intelligent thrift.

Fortunately, the two continents of America, so abundantly blessed by Providence, had, until the present war, been able to pursue their prosperous and dignified course free from the entanglements of European Militarism.

Even England, in all the majesty of her Imperial power, her flag gloriously waving over so many millions of free men, protected as she was by the waves which she ruled with grandeur and grace, had succeeded in avoiding the curse of continental conscriptionism.

Between permanent conscription, despotically imposed upon a nation under autocratic rule, and temporary military compulsion freely accepted by a noble people for the very purpose of saving Humanity from military absolutism, there is, every one must admit, a wide difference. I have been, I am, and will be, to my last day, the uncompromising opponent of autocratic conscription, which I consider as a permanent

crime against Christian Civilization, and the ready instrument of barbarous domination. To temporary compulsion I can agree, as a matter of patriotic and national duty, if the circumstances of the case are such that without its timely use, my country which has the first and undoubted right to my most patriotic devotion, at the cost of all I may own and even of my life, for her defence, would fall the prey to despotism which would bleed her to death to sway the world.

Such is the ordeal through which Canada, the British Empire, in fact much the greater part of the universe, are passing with torrents of blood shed to rescue Mankind from the domination of German militarism.

If Germany could have her course free; if she could reach the goal of her criminal ambition, nearly the whole world would be, for many long years, in the throes of the most abominable conscriptionism.

If after the enthusiasm of voluntary military service has exhausted itself from the very successful result of its patriotic effort, is it not a duty for all loyal citizens to accept temporary compulsion, to save their country from the horrors of defeat at the hands of the most cruel enemy which has ever shamed the light of the sun since it shines over the Human race blessed with Christian principles and moral teachings.

To the present generation of young men, strong, healthy, brave, let us say: be worthy of the times you live in, be equal to the great task imposed upon you, accepting with patriotism

the sacrifices you are called upon to make, never forgetting that temporary compulsion for you means freedom from permanent conscription for your children and children's children in years to come.

It is from the very height of such lofty considerations that I have made up my mind about this much vexed question which will, we must all earnestly hope, be more and more well understood and eventually settled to the everlasting good of the country once for all delivered from the exasperating menace of German despotism.

I must reserve for the second volume of this work, the fuller expression of my views of what should be the military system to be maintained in Canada, after the very wide experience we will have derived from the present great war. All I will add now is that ever since the early eighties of the last century, after many years of voluntary service in the Canadian Militia, I had fully realized that it is no more possible to make a real soldier by a few days yearly training, for three years, than you can make a competent lawyer of a young man studying law for a fortnight in the course of three consecutive years.

Since the federal Union of the Provinces we had spent much more than a hundred million of dollars for the training of our militia, with the appalling result that when came the day of getting ready for the fray, we had not two thousand men to send at once to the firing line. The first thirty thousands of the brave men who enthusiastically volunteered to go to the front had to

be trained, at Valcartier and in England, several months before being sent to face the enemy whose waves of permanent divisions of armed men had overrun, like a torrent, Belgium and northern France. Of course, our boys fought and died like heroes, but nevertheless we at last learned, at our great cost, that soldiers no more than lawyers, doctors, merchants, transportation managers, bankers, business men of all callings, farmers, sailors, etc., can be qualified in a day.

When the time shall come to consider what will be the requirements of our military organization, after this terrible struggle is over, I hope none will forget that war is a great science, an awful and very difficult art, so that we shall not deceive ourselves any longer by the illusion that an army can be drawn from the earth in twenty four hours.

Our most efficient military commander cannot entertain the foolish delusion of Pompey, so crushingly beaten by Cæsar, at Pharsalia, that he can raise legions by striking the ground with his foot.

If our future national circumstances turn out to be such, after the restoration of peace, that we will not be called upon to make heavy sacrifices for defence – let Providence so bless our dear country – it will then be much more rational to save our money than to squander it on a military system which cannot produce military efficiency.

The future can be trusted to settle favourably its own difficulties. For us of the present generation, we have to attend

to the imperative and sacred duty of the hour. Let no one shirk his responsibilities, waver in the heavy task, falter before the sacrifices to be patriotically and heroically accepted. To deserve the everlasting gratitude of future generations, we must secure to them the blessings of permanent peace in a renovated world freed from the tyranny of autocratic despotism.

Surely, I will be permitted to say that, undertaking to write *England, Canada and the Great War*, I fully realized my bounden duty to study all the questions raised by the terrible struggle, unreservedly, absolutely, outside of all party considerations, of all racial prejudices. A party man, in the only true and patriotic sense of the word, during the twenty-five years of my active political life, as a journalist and a member of the Quebec Legislature and of the Parliament of Canada, it became my lot in the official position which I was asked to accept and which I loyally filled, to all intents and purposes, for many years, to train my mind more and more to judge public questions solely from the point of view of the public good. I do not mean to say that partyism, well understood and patriotically practiced, is not productive of good to a country blessed with free institutions. But certainly in the course of a progressive, intelligent and eventful national life, ennobled by Freedom happily enjoyed, times occur when it behoves every one to rise superior to all other considerations, however important they may be, to serve the only one worthy of all sacrifices: the salvation of the country. Never was this principle so true, so imperative, than on the day

when the world was so audaciously challenged by Germany to the deadly conflict still raging with undiminished fury.

That most important question of military obligatory service, brought up by the pressure of the imperious necessities of military operations, lengthening and intensifying to unforeseen proportions, was for many weeks considered by Parliament. Surely, no one for a single moment entertained the idea that, however desirable and imperative it was for the representatives of the people to be of only one mind so far as the prosecution of Canada's share in the war was concerned, constant unanimity of opinion was possible respecting the various measures to be adopted to that end. Parliament sitting in the performance of its constitutional functions, with all its undoubted privileges, could not be expected not to exercise its right to debate all the matters constitutionally proposed for its concurrence and approval. I must certainly and wisely refrain from any comment whatsoever upon the lengthy discussion of the Military Service Act in both Houses in Ottawa. Having received the Royal Assent, the Bill is now the law of the land. All will patriotically rejoice to see that without waiving their right to pronounce upon the deeds and the views of those who are responsible to them, the free citizens of Canada will cheerfully accept the new sacrifices imposed by the obligation of carrying the war to a successful issue, praying to God to bless their patriotic efforts, and even with the true Christian spirit, to forgive guilty Germany if she will only repent for her crimes, and agree to repair a reasonable part of the

immense damages she has wrought upon trodden and martyred nations.

I hope, – and most ardently wish – that all my readers will agree with me that next to the necessity of winning the war – and, may I say, even as of almost equal importance for the future grandeur of our beloved country – range that of promoting by all lawful means harmony and good will amongst all our countrymen, whatever may be their racial origin, their religious faith, their particular aspirations not conflicting with their devotion to Canada as a whole, nor with their loyalty to the British Empire, whose greatness and prestige they want to firmly help to uphold with the inspiring confidence that more and more they will be the unconquerable bulwark of Freedom, Justice, Civilization and Right.

After having so fully expressed my profound conviction of what I consider to be my sacred duty as a loyal British subject, I feel sure I will be allowed to ask my English-speaking countrymen not to judge my French compatriots by the sayings and deeds of persons, too well gifted and too prone to injure their future and that of the whole country itself, but utterly disqualified and impotent to do them any good.

Need I affirm that my French Canadian compatriots are loyal at heart, a liberty loving and peaceful people, law-abiding citizens, fairly minded, intelligent, hard working, industrious. They have done, they are doing, and will do, their fair share for the progress and the future greatness of our wide and mighty

Dominion. To all those who desire to appreciate their course in all fairness and Christian Justice, I will say: do not fail to take into account that like all other national groups they are liable, in overtrying circumstances, to be in a certain measure wrongly influenced by deficiencies of leadership, but depend that they cannot be, for any length of time, carried away by unscrupulous players on their feelings. Some of them were deceived by persistent efforts to persuade them that England was, as much as Germany, guilty of having precipitated the great war which has been the curse of almost the whole world for the last four years. The accumulated remembrance of their staunch loyalty and patriotism during more than a century and a half will do much to favour the harmonious relations of all Canadians of good will who, I have no doubt, comprise millions of well wishers of the glorious destiny of our country.

May I be allowed to conclude by saying that my most earnest desire is to do all in my power, in the rank and file of the great army of free men, to reach the goal which ought to be the most persevering and patriotic ambition of loyal Canadians of all origins and creeds.

And I repeat, wishing my words to be re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of the land I so heartily cherish: – I have always been, I am and will ever be, to my last breath, true to my oath of allegiance to my Sovereign and to my country.

CHAPTER I.

Who Are The Guilty Parties?

Any one sincerely wishing to arrive at a sound opinion on the great war raging for the last four years, must necessarily make a serious study of the causes which led to the terrific struggle so horribly straining the energies of the civilized world to escape tyrannical domination. The case having been so fully discussed, and the responsibilities of the assailant belligerents so completely proved, I surely need not show at length that the German Emperor, his military party, the group of the German population called Junkers, are to the highest degree, the guilty parties of all the woful wrongs imposed upon Mankind and of the bloodshed unprecedented in all the ages.

The German Empire had for many years decided that it would not alone attempt to dominate the world. It wanted a partner to share the responsibility of the crime it was ready to commit at the first favourable opportunity, but a docile partner which she could direct at will, command with imperious orders, and crush without mercy at the first move of resistance. That plying tool was found in the complicity of Austria-Hungary, for years under the sway of Berlin diplomacy.

No sane man, if he is sincere, if he is honest, can now, for a single moment, hesitate to proclaim that between Germany and

Austria-Hungary, and the group of nations henceforth bearing the glorious name of The Allies, Right and Justice are on the side of England, of France, of the United States, of Belgium, of Italy, of Canada.

Where is the man with a sound mind, with a strong heart, beating with the noble impulses of righteousness, with a soul dignified by lofty aspirations, who ignores to-day that for fifty years previous to the declaration of war, in August 1914, Germany had been perfecting her military organization for a grand effort at universal domination?

All my life a close student of History, I was much impressed by the constant Policy of England to maintain Peace during the last century. When the World emerged from the great wars of the Napoleonic Era, she firmly took her stand in favour of peaceful relations between the nations, trusting more and more for the future prosperity of them all to the advantages to be derived from the permanency of friendly intercourse, from the ever increasing development of international trade, prompted by the freest possible exchanges of the products of all the countries blessed by Providence with large and varied resources. Her statesmen, so many of them truly worthy of this name, however divided they may have been with regard to questions of domestic government and internal reforms, were most united about the course to be followed respecting foreign relations. Perhaps more than all others having a say in the management of the world's affairs at large, they fully realized that no nation could prosper

and successfully work out her destinies by systematically trying to injure her neighbours. No independent country can become wealthier, happier, and greater, by spreading ruin and devastation around her frontiers.

The most convincing evidence that England was constantly favourable to the maintenance of peace amongst the great Powers of the World, for the last hundred years, is found in her permanent determination not to be drawn into the vortex of European continental militarism, so powerfully developed by Prussianism. She could have organized a standing army of millions of men. She would not. True, during the few years which preceded the present hurricane, some of the most eminent of England's military officers, notably, foremost amongst them, Lord Roberts, seeing, with their eyes wide open, the aggravated dangers accumulating on the darkening horizon, warned their countrymen about the threatening waves which menaced the future of the world. But British public opinion, as a whole, would not depart from her almost traditional policy of "*non-intervention*". For nearly a century, Great Britain maintained her "*splendid isolation*", trusting to the sound sense which should always govern the world to protect Mankind against the horrors of a general war. Never was this great national policy better exemplified than during the long and glorious reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. For more than fifty years, she graced one of the most illustrious Thrones that ever presided over the destinies of a great Empire, with sovereign dignity, with womanly

virtues, with motherly devotion, with patriotic respect of the constitutional liberties of her free subjects. When she departed for a better world, she was succeeded by the great King and Emperor – Edward VII. – who, during the few years of his memorable reign, proved himself so much the friendly supporter of harmony and good will amongst the nations that he deserved to be called "The King of the Peace of the World."

CHAPTER II.

The Persistent Efforts of England in Favour of Peace

In 1891, Lord Salisbury, then Prime Minister of England, witnessing the constant progress of Prussian militarism on land and sea, and fully conscious of the misfortunes it was preparing for Humanity, ordered an official statement to be made of the extravagant cost of the European military organization, and sent it confidentially to the German Kaiser, who took no notice of it.

In 1896, Lord Salisbury lays before the Czar of Russia all the information he has obtained on the question of militarism in Europe. On the 28th of August, 1898, the Emperor of Russia addressed to the world his celebrated Manifesto in favour of peace. It urged, first, the necessity of a truly permanent peace; second, the limitation of military preparation which, in its ever increasing development, was causing the economic ruin of the nations.

The conferences of The Hague in favour of an international agreement for the maintenance of peace were the direct result of the initiative of the British Prime Minister, who foresaw the frightful consequences for Humanity of the enormous development of militarism by the German Empire.

All the great Powers of Europe and America, together with the

secondary states, at once heartily concurred with the proposition of the Czar of Russia. Unfortunately, there were two sad exceptions to the consent to consider the salutary purpose so anxiously desired by those who valued as they should all the benefits the world would have derived from an international system assuring permanent peace. Germany and Austria, the latter already for years dominated by the former, opposed the patriotic move of the Emperor of Russia, suggested to him by Great Britain. They agreed to be represented at the Conferences for the only object of thwarting the efforts in favour of a satisfactory enactment of new rules of International Law to henceforth protect the world against a general conflagration, and to free the nations from the crushing burdens of a militarism daily developing more extravagant.

Ministerial changes in Great Britain in no way altered this part of the foreign policy of the Mother Country. In 1905, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman became Prime Minister of England. He was well known to be an ardent pacifist. Deprecating the mad increase of unchecked militarism, he said, in his ministerial program: —

"A policy of huge armaments keeps alive and stimulates and feeds the belief that force is the best, if not the only, solution of international differences."

On the 8th of March, 1906, Lord Haldane, then Minister of War, declared in the British House of Commons: —

"I wish we were near the time when the nations would consider

together the reduction of armaments... Only by united action can we get rid of the burden which is pressing so heavily on all civilized nations."

The second Conference of The Hague which took place in July and October, 1907, was then being organized. Russia was again its official promoter. Well aware of the uncompromising stand of Germany on the question of reduced armaments, she had not included that matter in the program she had decided to lay before the Conference. The British Government did all they could to have it placed on the orders to be taken into consideration. A member of the Labor Party, Mr. Vivian, moved in the House of Commons, that the Conference of The Hague be called upon to discuss that most important subject. His motion was unanimously and enthusiastically carried.

Informing the House that the Cabinet heartily approved the Resolution, Sir Edward Grey, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, said:

"I do not believe that at any time has the conscious public opinion in the various countries of Europe set more strongly in the direction of peace than at the present time, and yet the burden of military and naval expenditure goes on increasing. No greater service could it (the Hague Conference) do, than to make the conditions of peace less expensive than they are at the present time... It is said we are waiting upon foreign nations in order to reduce our expenditure. As a matter of fact, we are all waiting on each other. Some day or other somebody must take the first step..."

I do, on behalf of the Government, not only accept, but welcome such a resolution as this as a wholesome and beneficial expression of opinion."

In July, 1906, a most important meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union took place in London. Twenty-three countries, enjoying the privileges, in various proportions, of free institutions, were represented at this memorable Congress of Nations. In the course of his remarkable opening speech of the first sitting, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Prime Minister, said: —

"Urge your Governments, in the name of humanity, to go into The Hague Conference as we ourselves hope to go, pledged to diminished charges in respect of armaments."

A motion embodying the views so earnestly pressed by the British Government was unanimously carried.

On the fifth of March, 1907, only four months before the opening of the Second Hague Conference, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, affirming the bounden duty of England to propose the restriction of armaments, said, in the British House of Commons: —

"Holding the opinion that there is a great movement of feeling among thinking people in all the nations of the world, in favor of some restraint on the enormous expenditure involved in the present system so long as it exists... We have desired and still desire to place ourselves in the very front rank of those who think that the warlike attitude of powers, as displayed by the excessive growth of armaments is a curse to Europe, and the sooner it is checked,

in however moderate a degree, the better."

Unfortunately, German hostility to reduced armaments prevented any good result from the second Hague Conference in the way of checking extravagant and ruinous military organization. There was sad disappointment in all the reasonable world and specially in England at this deplorable outcome. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman expressed it as follows: —

"We had hoped that some great advance might be made towards a common consent to arrest the wasteful and growing competition in naval and military armaments. We were disappointed."

Unshaken in her determination to do her utmost to protect Civilization against the threatening and ever increasing dangers of German militarism, England persisted with the most laudable perseverance in her noble efforts to that much desired end. But all her pleadings, however convincing, were vain. Germany was obdurate. Finally, on the 30th of March, 1911, speaking in the Reichstag, the German Imperial Chancellor threw off the mask, and positively declared that the question of reduced armaments admitted of no possible solution *"as long as men were men and States were States."*

A more brutal declaration could hardly have been made. It was a cynical challenge to the World. Times were maturing and Germany was anxiously waiting for the opportunity to strike the blow which would stagger Humanity.

Through all the great crisis of July and August, 1914,

directly consequent upon the odious crime of Sarajevo, England exhausted all her efforts to maintain peace, but unfortunately without avail.

Knowing very well how much England sincerely wished the maintenance of peace, the German Government was to the last moment under the delusion that it could succeed in having Great Britain to remain neutral in a general European war. They were not ashamed to presume they could bribe England. Without blushing they made to the British Government the infamous proposition contained in the following despatch from Sir E. Goschen, the British Ambassador at Berlin, to Sir Edward Grey, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: —

Sir E. Goschen to Sir Edward Grey (Received July 29)

Berlin, July 29, 1914.

(Telegraphic.)

I was asked to call upon the Chancellor to-night. His Excellency had just returned from Potsdam.

He said that should Austria be attacked by Russia a European conflagration might, he feared, become inevitable, owing to Germany's obligation as Austria's ally, in spite of his continued efforts to maintain peace. He then proceeded to make the following strong bid for British neutrality. He said that it was clear, so far as he was

able to judge the main principle which governed British policy, that Great Britain would never stand by and allow France to be crushed in any conflict there might be. That, however, was not the object at which Germany aimed. Provided that neutrality of Great Britain was certain, every assurance would be given to the British Government that the Imperial Government aimed at no territorial acquisitions at the expense of France should they prove victorious in any war that might ensue.

I questioned his Excellency about the French colonies, and he said he was unable to give a similar undertaking in that respect. As regards Holland, however, his Excellency said that, so long as Germany's adversaries respected the integrity and neutrality of the Netherlands, Germany was ready to give His Majesty's Government an assurance that she would do likewise. It depended upon the action of France what operations Germany might be forced to enter upon in Belgium, but when the war was over, Belgian integrity would be respected if she had not sided against Germany.

His Excellency ended by saying that ever since he had been Chancellor the object of his policy had been, as you were aware, to bring about an understanding with England; he trusted that these assurances might form the basis of that understanding which he so much desired. He had in mind a general neutrality agreement between England and Germany, though it was of course at the present moment too early to discuss details, and an assurance of British neutrality in the conflict which present crisis might possibly

produce, would enable him to look forward to realisation of his desire.

In reply to his Excellency's inquiry how I thought his request would appeal to you, I said that I did not think it probable that at this stage of events you would care to bind yourself to any course of action and that I was of opinion that you would desire to retain full liberty.

Our conversation upon this subject having come to an end, I communicated the contents of your telegram of to-day to his Excellency, who expressed his best thanks to you.

To the foregoing outrageous proposition, the Government of Great Britain gave the proud and noble reply which follows, for all times to be recorded in diplomatic annals to the eternal honour and glory of the Ministers who incurred the responsibility of, and of the distinguished diplomat who drafted, that memorable document: —

Sir Edward Grey to Sir E. Goschen

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, July 30, 1914.

Your telegram of 29th July.

His Majesty's Government cannot for a moment entertain the Chancellor's proposal that they should bind themselves to neutrality on such terms.

What he asks us in effect is to engage to stand by while

French colonies are taken and France is beaten so long as Germany does not take French territory as distinct from the colonies.

From the material point of view such a proposal is unacceptable, for France, without further territory in Europe being taken from her, could be so crushed as to lose her position as a Great Power, and become subordinate to German policy.

Altogether, apart from that, it would be a disgrace for us to make this bargain with Germany at the expense of France, a disgrace from which the good name of this country would never recover.

The Chancellor also in effect asks us to bargain away whatever obligation or interest we have as regards the neutrality of Belgium. We could not entertain that bargain either.

Having said so much, it is unnecessary to examine whether the prospect of a future general neutrality agreement between England and Germany offered positive advantages sufficient to compensate us for tying our hands now. We must preserve our full freedom to act as circumstances may seem to us to require in any such unfavourable and regrettable development of the present crisis as the Chancellor contemplates.

You should speak to the Chancellor in the above sense, and add most earnestly that the only way of maintaining the good relations between England and Germany is that they should continue to work together to preserve the peace of Europe; if we succeed in this object, the mutual relations

of Germany and England will, I believe, be **ipso facto** improved and strengthened. For that object His Majesty's Government will work in that way with all sincerity and good-will.

And I will say this: if the peace of Europe can be preserved, and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavour will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany will be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately. I have desired this and worked for it, as far as I could, through the last Balkan crisis, and, Germany having a corresponding object, our relations sensibly improved. The idea has hitherto been too Utopian to form the subject of definite proposals, but if this present crisis, so much more acute than any that Europe has gone through for generations, be safely passed, I am hopeful that the relief and reaction which will follow may make possible some more definite rapprochement between the Powers than has been possible hitherto.

The British Government could not take a more dignified stand and express their indignation at the infamous proposal in stronger and more noble terms.

Let us now read the indignant protest of Mr. Asquith, the British Prime Minister, against the outrageous German proposition, addressed to the House of Commons, where it raised a storm of applause, proclaiming to the World the dogged determination of England to wage war rather than agree to the

dishonourable German proposal: —

What does that amount to? Let me just ask the House. I do so, not with the object of inflaming passion, certainly not with the object of exciting feeling against Germany, but I do so to vindicate and make clear the position of the British Government in this matter. What did that proposal amount to? In the first place, it meant this: That behind the back of France — they were not made a party to these communications — we should have given, if we had assented to that, a free license to Germany to annex, in the event of a successful war, the whole of the extra European dominions and possessions of France. What did it mean as regards Belgium? When she addressed, as she has addressed in the last few days, her moving appeal to us to fulfil our solemn guarantee of her neutrality, what reply should we have given? What reply should we have given to that Belgian appeal? We should have been obliged to say that without her knowledge we had bartered away to the Power threatening her our obligation to keep our plighted word. The House has read, and the country has read, of course, in the last few hours, the most pathetic appeal addressed by the King of Belgium, and I do not envy the man who can read that appeal with an unmoved heart. Belgians are fighting and losing their lives. What would have been the position of Great Britain to-day in the face of that spectacle if we had assented to this infamous proposal? Yes, and what are we to get in return for the betrayal of our friends and the dishonour of our obligations? What are we to get in return? A promise — nothing more; a promise as to what Germany would do in

certain eventualities; a promise, be it observed – I am sorry to say it, but it must be put upon record – given by a Power which was at that very moment announcing its intention to violate its own treaty, and inviting us to do the same. I can only say, if we had dallied or temporized, we, as a Government, should have covered ourselves with dishonour, and we should have betrayed the interests of this country, of which we are trustees.

After quoting and eulogizing the telegraphic despatch of Sir Edward Grey to Sir E. Goschen, dated July 30, 1914, Mr. Asquith proceeded as follows: —

That document, in my opinion, states clearly, in temperate and convincing language, the attitude of this Government. Can any one who reads it fail to appreciate the tone of obvious sincerity and earnestness which underlies it; can any one honestly doubt that the Government of this country in spite of great provocation – and I regard the proposals made to us as proposals which we might have thrown aside without consideration and almost without answer – can any one doubt that in spite of great provocation the right hon. gentleman, who had already earned the title – and no one ever more deserved it – of Peace Maker of Europe, persisted to the very last moment of the last hour in that beneficent but unhappily frustrated purpose. I am entitled to say, and I do so on behalf of this country – I speak not for a party, I speak for the country as a whole – that we made every effort any Government could possibly make for peace. But this war has been forced upon us. What

is it we are fighting for? Every one knows, and no one knows better than the Government the terrible incalculable suffering, economic, social, personal and political, which war, and especially a war between the Great Powers of the world must entail. There is no man amongst us sitting upon this bench in these trying days – more trying perhaps than any body of statesmen for a hundred years have had to pass through, there is not a man amongst us who has not, during the whole of that time, had clearly before his vision the almost unequalled suffering which war, even in just cause, must bring about, not only to the peoples who are for the moment living in this country and in the other countries of the world, but to posterity and to the whole prospects of European civilization. Every step we took with that vision before our eyes, and with a sense of responsibility which it is impossible to describe. Unhappily, if in spite of all our efforts to keep the peace, and with that full and overpowering consciousness of the result, if the issue be decided in favour of war, we have, nevertheless, thought it to be the duty as well as the interest of this country to go to war, the House may be well assured it was because we believe, and I am certain the Country will believe, we are unsheathing our sword in a just cause.

If I am asked what we are fighting for I reply in two sentences. In the first place to fulfil a solemn international obligation, an obligation which, if it had been entered into between private persons in the ordinary concerns of life, would have been regarded as an obligation not only of law but of honour, which no self-respecting man could possibly

have repudiated. I say, secondly, we are fighting to vindicate the principle which, in these days when force, material force, sometimes seems to be the dominant influence and factor in the development of mankind, we are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed, in defiance of international good faith, by the military will of a strong and overmastering Power. I do not believe any nation ever entered into a great controversy – and this is one of the greatest history will ever know – with a clearer conscience and stronger conviction that it is fighting, not for aggression, not for the maintenance even of its own selfish interest, but that it is fighting in defence of principles, the maintenance of which is vital to the civilisation of the world. With a full conviction, not only of the wisdom and justice, but of the obligations which lay upon us to challenge this great issue, we are entering into the struggle.

The German Government refusing to order their army to retire from the Belgian territory it had violated, at midnight, 4th to 5th August, 1914, the whole British Empire was at war with the whole German Empire.

Surely, there is not the slightest necessity to argue any more that in the terrific war raging for the last four years, Justice and Right are on the side of England and her Allies. No war was ever more just, waged with equal honour for the triumph of Liberty and Civilization, for the protection of Humanity against the onslaught of barbarism developed to the cruelty of the darkest

ages of History.

CHAPTER III.

The Call To Duty In Canada

Every one knows how the news of the State of War between the British and German Empires were received in our great Canadian Dominion, after the days of anxious waiting which culminated in the rallying of England to the defence of the cause of Freedom and Civilization. When the call for duty was sounded in the Capital of the British Empire, it rolled over the mighty Atlantic, spreading over the length and breadth of Canada, being re-echoed with force in our Province of Quebec.

At once called to prepare for the emergency, the Canadian Parliament met and unanimously decided that the Dominion would, of her own free will and patriotic decision, participate in the Great War. The course of events in Canada, for the last four years, is well known by all. It is recent history.

My special object in condensing in this book the defence which I considered it my duty to make of the just and sacred cause of the British Empire, and her Allies, in the great war still raging with undiminished fury, being to show how I did, to the best of my ability, try to persuade my French Canadian Countrymen where was the true path of duty, and how false and disloyal were the unscrupulous theories of "Nationalism", I must first review the successive movements of public opinion in the

Province of Quebec.

In the preceding sentence, I have intently affirmed that the cause of the Allies was that of the whole British Empire. Surely, it should not be necessary to say so, as no truly loyal British subject would for a moment hesitate to come to that patriotic conclusion. Still, however incredible it is, the duty of the British colonies to rally to the flag to defend the Empire and participate in the deadly struggle between Civilization and barbarism, was challenged by the leaders of the "Nationalist school" in the Province of Quebec. Of course, that school never represented more than a small minority of thought and numbers. But, sad to admit, a fanatical minority, in days of trying sacrifices, can do a great deal of injury to a people by inflaming national and religious prejudices. We, French Canadians, have had much to suffer from the unpatriotic efforts of a few to bring our countrymen to take an erroneous view of the situation.

At the opening of the war, the general opinion in the Province of Quebec was without doubt strongly in favor of Canada's participation in the struggle. Any student of the working of our constitutional system knows how the strength of public opinion is ascertained, outside of a general election, in all cases, and more specially with regard to measures of paramount importance when the country has to deal with a national emergency.

The Parliament of Canada is the authorized representative of the Country. Called in a special session, at the very outbreak of the hostilities, they voted unanimously that it was our duty to

participate in the war. All the representatives of the Province of Quebec heartily joined with those of all the other Provinces to vote this unanimous decision.

In the light of events ever since, who can now reasonably pretend that the patriotic decision of the Parliament of Canada was not entirely, even enthusiastically, approved by the Canadian people? The press, even in the Province of Quebec, with only one exception of any consequence, was unanimous in its approval of the action of Parliament.

The heads of our Church, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, in their very important Pastoral Letter on the duties of the Catholics in the present war, positively said: —

"We must acknowledge it — (nous ne saurions nous le dissimuler —): that conflict, one of the most terrific the world has yet seen, cannot but have its repercussion in our country. England is engaged into it, and who does not see that the fate of all the component parts of the Empire is bound with the fate of her arms. She relies upon our support, and that support, we are happy to say, has been generously offered to her both in men and money."

No representative of public opinion, of any weight, outside of Parliament, professional men, leaders of finance, commerce and industry, in the Province of Quebec, raised a word of disapproval at the Parliamentary call to arms.

Not one meeting was called, not one resolution was moved, to oppose the decision of the Canadian Parliament.

Not one petition was addressed to the two Houses in Ottawa against Canada's participation in the war.

Every one in the Province of Quebec knew that participating in the war would entail heavy financial sacrifices, and that the taxation of the country would have to be largely increased to meet the new obligations we had freely decided to incur for the salvation of the Empire and of Civilization.

The Government of the day proposed the financial measures they considered necessary to raise the public revenue which the circumstances required. Those measures were unanimously approved by Parliament. The taxpayers of the country, those of the Province of Quebec like all the others, willingly and patriotically accepted and paid without complaint the new taxes into the public treasury. During more than the three first years of the war, I visited a good part of the Province of Quebec, and addressed several large public meetings. Everywhere my attention was forcibly struck by the prompt willingness of my French Canadian countrymen to bear their share of the financial sacrifices Canada was called upon to make for the triumph of the cause of the Allies.

CHAPTER IV.

Recruiting By Voluntary Service

No stronger evidence could be given of the determination of the country as a whole, and over all its component parts, to support Great Britain and her Allies to final success, than the truly wonderful record of the voluntary enlistment of more than four hundred thousand men, of all walks in life, to rush to the front.

Recruiting in the Province of Quebec indeed started very well. Several thousands of French Canadian youth rallied to the colors. I hope and trust that, sooner or later, it will be possible to make a more satisfactory statistical record of the number of French Canadians who enlisted. I am fully convinced that the total is somewhat much larger than the figures usually quoted. It would surely be conducive to a better understanding of the case, if such statistical information was carefully prepared and made public. It is easily conceivable that the pressure of the work of maintaining the splendid Canadian army renders it perhaps difficult to attend actually to the details of that compilation. So we can afford to wait for the redress of figures which may constitute a wrong to the race second in numbers but equal to any in patriotism in Canada.

Pending my remarks upon certain causes which have

contributed to check recruiting amongst the French element in the Province of Quebec, I consider it important to mention those which were easy to ascertain and comprehend.

It is a well known fact that early marriages are a rule in the Province of Quebec much more than in the other Provinces of the Dominion. As a natural consequence, the available number of young unmarried men for recruiting purposes was proportionately less. I myself have known parishes in our Province where half a dozen of unmarried young men from twenty years of age and upwards could not be found.

It was easily to foresee that a comparison would be made between the number of Canadian-born volunteers in the English-speaking Provinces and that from the Province of Quebec. The degree of enthusiasm for enlistment in the other Provinces between the foreign born and the Canadian born has also been noticed. It has generally been admitted that most naturally the young men recently arrived in Canada were more strongly appealed to by all the sacred ties still binding them to their mother land. When generations have, for more than a century, enjoyed all the blessings of peace and lived far away from the turmoil of warlike preparations and military conflicts, is it to be much wondered at that the entire population is not at once permeated with the feeling of the dangers ahead, and do not rise rapidly to the full sense of the duty she is suddenly called upon to perform.

My daily personal intercourse with hundreds of my French

Canadian compatriots allowed me to realize that many of them, even amongst the leading classes, were over-confident that the Allies representing at the beginning the united effort of England, France and Russia, soon to be reinforced by Italy, breaking away from the Central Powers, would certainly be equal to the task of being victorious over German militarism. Repeatedly, before public meetings and in very numerous private conversations, I urgently implored my hearers not to be so deluded, doing my best to convince them that it would be a fatal error to shut our eyes from the truth, that the military power of Central Europe, comprising the two great Empires of Germany and Austria, Bulgaria, with the help of Asiatic Turkey, and the undisguised support of baneful teutonic influences and intrigues at the courts of Petrograd and Athens, was gigantic, and that the terrible conflict would surely develop into a struggle for life and death between human freedom and barbarism.

This feeling of over-confidence was passing away, when it became evident that to triumph over the modern huns and their associates was no easy task; that the goal of freeing humanity from the threatening universal domination would require the most determined effort of the nations who had heroically undertaken to reach it.

CHAPTER V.

Intervention of Nationalism

The great struggle being waged with increased intensity, it was daily becoming more and more evident that the Allied nations were bound to muster all their courage, perseverance and resources to successfully fight their determined foe. It was just at the thick of this critical situation, calling forth the devotion and patriotism of all, that the "Nationalist" campaign of false theories and principles was launched with renewed activity in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Henri Bourassa, ex-member of Labelle in the House of Commons, was, and still is, the recognized leader of the "Nationalist School" in our Province, and wherever it finds adherents. His personal organ, "*Le Devoir*," is daily expounding the doctrines of that School.

In October, 1915, Mr. Bourassa issued a pamphlet of over four hundred pages entitled: – "*What do we owe England?*" – in French: – "*Que devons-nous à l'Angleterre?*"

In the long overdrawn and farfetched argumentation of this volume, the author's effort is to try and prove that Canada owes nothing to England, that all those who favour the Canadian participation in the war are "revolutionists," that we are unduly paying a large tribute to the Empire.

In 1916, Mr. Bourassa supplemented his first book with a second pamphlet, entitled: – "*Yesterday, To-day, To-morrow*," in French: – "*Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain*," in which he amplified the views expressed in the preceding volume.

I undertook to read Mr. Bourassa's works, and I must say that I was astonished at what I found therein. I felt very strongly that his erroneous views – without questioning their sincerity – were bound to pervert the opinion of my French compatriots, to enflame their prejudices, and to do a great deal of harm in promoting the ever dangerous conflict of race fanaticism. Over forty years of experience of public life had taught me how easy it is to introduce a prejudice in a man's mind, but how difficult it is to destroy it when once it has taken root.

CHAPTER VI.

What Do We Owe England?

To this question raised by Mr. Bourassa, and argued at length by himself in the negative, I answered by a chapter of my book: – "*L'Angleterre, le Canada et la Grand Guerre*" – "*England, Canada and the Great War.*"

Great Britain, ever since she came to the conclusion that the days of the old colonial policy were passed, and agreed that we should freely govern ourselves, with ministerial responsibility, within the powers set forth in our constitutional charter, has scrupulously respected our political liberty. We have administered our own affairs at our own free will. The Imperial Government never attempted to interfere with the development of our federal politics. They would surely have declined such interference, if it had been asked for.

As long as we form part of the British Empire, it is evident that we owe to England that loyalty which every colony owes to her mother-country. Granted by the Sovereign Power ruling Canada the freest institutions, having the best of reasons to be fully satisfied with our relations with Great Britain, we are in duty bound to be loyal to her flag. We must be true to our allegiance.

We have freely decided to incur the sacrifices we are making for the war. We have so decided because we considered it of

the greatest importance, for the future of Humanity, that the German ambition for universal domination be foiled; that the British Empire be maintained; that France should continue a first class Power, as expressed by Mr. Asquith; that before all, and above all, the eternal principles of Right, Justice and Civilization, shall not be trampled upon by the terrific assault of teutonic barbarism. Moreover, we are also in duty bound to judge with fairness England's part in the great society of nations, and, especially, that she plays in the great events of the present crisis. Beyond doubt, a truly loyal Canadian must refrain from poisoning foreign opinion and that of his fellow British subjects against Great Britain in attributing her course to selfish interests, wilfully taking no account of her broad and admirable foreign policy, ever inspired by the steady desire to maintain peace.

In the first mentioned work, Mr. Bourassa lays great stress on the fact that for nearly a century and a half, previous to the South African War, Canada did not participate in the wars of the Empire. He extensively quotes from the documents and the discussions between Canada's representatives and the Imperial Government, respecting the defence of our country, and that of the Empire herself. He concludes by pretending that the result of all these negotiations and conventions was the agreement that Canada would have only to attend to her own defence, and that Great Britain was always obliged to protect us against all outside attacks. From these pretensions he draws the startling conclusion that all those who do not stand by the conventions he did his best

to emphasize are doing revolutionary work.

The answer to such extravagant notions is rather plain and easy. There was not the slightest necessity for the Nationalist leader to multiply lengthy quotations to prove what mere common sense settles at first thought: —

First: — That any country, whether it be independent or a colony, must defend itself when attacked by an enemy.

Second: — That a Sovereign State is bound to defend all the territory under its authority and covered by its flag.

But all this has nothing whatever to do with the very different question of Canada's participation, outside her own territory, in a war in which Great Britain is engaged, which participation Canada has freely, deliberately approved and ordered. Such was the case in 1914. The Parliament and the people of Canada at once realized that in the gigantic conflict into which Germany had drawn all the Great Powers of Europe, our future destiny as much as that of England herself was at stake. Without the slightest hesitation, unasked and unsolicited by the Mother Country, we decided that we were in duty bound to do our share to defend the great Empire of which we are a very important component part, and to help saving the world from tyrannical domination.

Much too often giving to words a meaning which they positively cannot convey, Mr. Bourassa argued at length to prove that the agreements, conventions, and understandings arrived at between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, at different

dates, were a *solemn treaty*.

How false and untenable such a pretention is, surely needs no lengthy argument. International Law knows no treaties but those made between Sovereign States. It is most absurd to pretend that a Sovereign State can make a treaty between herself and its own colony. Where is the man with the slightest notion of Constitutional Government who would pretend, for instance, that the British North American Act is a treaty between Great Britain and Canada. It is an Act passed by the Legislative authority of the Sovereign State to which we belong, enacting the conditions under which Canada would enjoy the rights and privileges of constitutional self-government, participating in the exercise of Sovereignty within the limits of the powers enumerated in the Act creating the Dominion. It was precisely because we knew we were acting within the limits of those powers, that we decided to join with England and her Allies in the great war.

CHAPTER VII.

Canada Is Not A Sovereign State

As long as Canada will remain under the flag of Great Britain – and for one I hope it will yet be for many long years, – it is evident that it will not be a "*Sovereign State*" in the full sense of the word.

One can hardly believe that the Nationalist leader, at page 17 of his pamphlet – "*Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain*" – "*Yesterday, Today, To-morrow*," opens a chapter with the title: "*Les Colonies autonomes sont des Etats Souverains.*" – "*The autonomous colonies are Sovereign States.*"

Mr. Bourassa was evidently led to the grievous error contained in the preceding title by a complete misapprehension of the true meaning of the word "*autonomous.*" He took "*autonomy*" for "*Sovereignty*," being under the delusion that the two are synonymous.

Any student of History knows, or ought to know, that after the war which culminated in the independence of the United States, England adopted an entirely new colonial policy. She was the first Sovereign Power, and has ever since remained the only one, to realize that the old system was doomed to failure, that it was worn out. Her leading statesmen, who always ranked amongst the most eminent the world over, were more and more

convinced that the only safe colonial policy was that which would grant "*self-government*" to the colonies, trained to its harmonious working, for their interior management. The true meaning of this new policy was that several of the colonies were, by acts of the Imperial Parliament, called to the exercise of a share of the Sovereignty, well defined in their respective constitutional charters. Canada was one of the first British colonies to enjoy the advantages of such a large part of the Sovereign rights.

Such "*autonomous colonies*" as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, have been, and are to the present day, do not transform them into "*Sovereign States*," enjoying full "Sovereign powers." They are not "*Independent States*" in the full sense of the word.

That Canada is not a Sovereign State is proved beyond doubt by the very fact that she could not amend or change her constitutional charter by her own power and without a new Imperial law. If the Nationalist leader's pretention was sound, any member of the House of Commons, or of the Senate, in Ottawa, could propose a bill to repeal the British North America Act, 1867, and to replace it by another constitutional charter. The very supposition is absurd. Can it be imagined that His Excellency the Governor-General could be advised by his responsible Ministers to sanction, in the name of His Majesty the Sovereign of Great Britain, a bill repealing an Act of the Imperial Parliament? Still it is exactly what Mr. Bourassa's theory amounts to.

Our constitutional charter does not only provide what is

called our Federal, – or National – autonomy, but also the Provincial autonomy. The powers of both are well defined in the Imperial Act. The Provinces of the Dominion also exercise that share of the Sovereign rights delegated to them by the Imperial Parliament. Would the Nationalist leader draw the extravagant conclusion that the territory of any one of the Provinces cannot be declared in the "State of War" with a Foreign Power, by His Majesty the King, without the assent of the Ministers of that Province? Still that absurd proposition would not be more so than that affirming the necessity of the assent of the Canadian Cabinet, to a declaration of War involving Canada in an Imperial struggle.

The Sovereign right of declaring war to, and of making peace with, another independent State, is vested in the King of Great Britain, acting upon the advice of his responsible Ministers in the United Kingdom. To the Imperial Parliament belongs the constitutional authority to deal with the Imperial Foreign Affairs.

It is plain that when Great Britain is at War with another Sovereign State the whole territory of the British Empire is in the "State of War" with that Nation.

It is inconceivable that Mr. Bourassa has seriously pretended that Canada was not at war with the German Empire the very moment the British Empire was so in consequence of the violation by Germany of Belgian neutrality. One can hardly believe that he has propounded the fallacious constitutional doctrine that His Majesty "*the King of England hath not the right*

to declare Canada in the State of War without the assent of the Canadian Cabinet."

Where and when has the Nationalist leader discovered that the Canadian Ministers have the right to advise His Majesty upon all the questions pertaining to the Imperial Foreign Affairs? Any one conversant with the constitutional status of Canada knows that the Canadian Ministers have the right to advise the representative of the Sovereign only upon matters as defined by the British North America Act, 1867, and its amendments.

I was indeed very much surprised at the attempt of Mr. Bourassa to use the authority of Sir Erskine May in support of his erroneous pretension that the autonomous colonies of Great Britain were Sovereign States.

To all the students of the Constitutional History of England, Sir Erskine May is a very well known and appreciated writer. I have read his works several times over for many years. I was certain that he had never written anything to justify the Nationalist leader in quoting him as he did.

Here follows the paragraph of May's Constitutional History quoted by Mr. Bourassa in support of his own views: —

Parliament has recently pronounced it to be just that the Colonies which enjoy self-government, should undertake the responsibility and cost of their own military defence. To carry this policy into effect must be the work of time. But whenever it may be effected, the last material bond of connection with the Colonies will have been severed, and

colonial states, acknowledging the honorary sovereignty of England, and fully armed for self-defence, as well against herself as others, will have grown out of the dependencies of the British Empire.

I must say that I am absolutely unable to detect one single word in the above quotation to authorize Mr. Bourassa to affirm that Sir Erskine May was of opinion that "*the autonomous colonies were Sovereign States.*" The true meaning of the above extract is surely very plain. What does it say? It declares, what was a fact, that the British *Parliament has recently pronounced it to be just that the Colonies which enjoy self-government should undertake the responsibility and cost of their own military defence.*

Would the British Parliament have deemed it necessary to express such an opinion, if the Colonies had, then, been Sovereign States, consequently obliged, in duty bound, to defend themselves *alone* against any possible enemy. Surely not, for the obvious reason that Great Britain would have had no more responsibility for the defence of territories no longer covered by her flag and under her Sovereignty.

The very fact that the British Parliament thought proper, *under the then circumstances*, to say that the Colonies enjoying self-government should undertake to defend themselves, is the convincing proof that they were not Sovereign States.

The following sentence of May's quotation says: —*To carry this policy into effect must be the work of time.*

It is clear that the *policy* requiring the work of time to be

carried into effect was not actually existent at the time Sir Erskine May was writing.

The extract quoted by Mr. Bourassa concludes by declaring that when such a policy *has* been finally adopted, the Colonies will have developed into Colonial States having *grown out of the dependencies of the British Empire*.

Evidently, when the Dominions of Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, will have grown out of the dependencies of the British Empire, they will no longer be Colonies of Great Britain. But when will that very important event take place? Surely, Sir Erskine May could not foresee. Even to-day Mr. Bourassa cannot say more than any one else. Pending that unforeseen outcome, the Dominions will remain parts of the British Empire under her Sovereignty.

The above quotation was taken by Mr. Bourassa from the edition of Sir Erskine May's "Constitutional History" published in 1912. But they were first edited by the author in 1863. When has the Imperial Parliament adopted the above mentioned "*Resolution*"? It was voted in 1862 – the 4th of March – more than fifty-six years ago. Quoted as it has been by Mr. Bourassa, it appears to have been only very recently adopted. The fact that it is more than half a century old, and was carried before the Federal Union of the Provinces, is a convincing proof that it has no bearing whatever upon the conditions of Canada's present colonial status. By the aforesaid "*Resolution*," the British House of Commons was only expressing the opinion that the time had

come for the Colonies to undertake the responsibility and the cost of their defence. The "Resolution" does not say that Great Britain would no longer be called, in the exercise of the rights and duties of her Sovereignty, to defend her Colonial Empire.

By what reasoning can a mere expression of opinion by the English House of Commons be interpreted as at once transforming the Colonies into independent Sovereign States?

Any one somewhat conversant with the political events that led to the Federal Union of the Provinces knows that in applying to the British Parliament for the new Constitutional Charter, the Legislature of United Canada had a twofold object: – first, the settlement of the constitutional difficulties then pending between Upper and Lower Canada; secondly, a broader development of Canada and also of the British Empire. Such was the purpose of the coalition government formed in 1864. All the members of that Cabinet were strongly in favour of the maintenance of Canada's union with Great Britain. I have heard them expounding their views on what the future of Canada ought to be. I am positive that neither Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Georges Cartier, the honorable Georges Brown, nor any of their colleagues, of both political parties, ever said a word which could be construed as expressing the opinion that the proposed Federal Union would make of Canada an independent Sovereign State. It is incredible that Mr. Bourassa should have so erroneously understood their real views so as to pretend that they favoured Confederation for that very purpose.

As a proof of his pretension, he quoted the following words of Sir John A. Macdonald, in the Legislative Assembly of old United Canada: —

"With us the Sovereign, or, in this country the representative of the Sovereign, can act only on the advice of His Ministers, those Ministers being responsible to the people through Parliament."

Mr. Bourassa used the foregoing sentence in support of his contention that the King of England could not declare war without the assent of the Canadian Cabinet. It is impossible to understand how such a notion can be seriously held and expressed. His Majesty cannot ask nor accept such an advice, if it was tendered, for the very reason that the Canadian Cabinet has not the constitutional right to advise the King respecting the international relations of the Empire. And why? Precisely because the Canadian Ministers would not be responsible for their advice to the Imperial Parliament and to the electorate of the United Kingdom.

The true meaning of the above quoted sentence of Sir John A. Macdonald is very plain. Ministerial responsibility was the fundamental principle of the old Constitution, as it is of the Federal Charter. Sir John A. Macdonald was perfectly right in affirming that *"in Canada, as in England, the Sovereign could act only on the advice of His Ministers,"* that is to say *on the advice of His responsible Ministers within the constitutional powers of our Parliament on all matters respecting which they had the constitutional right to advise His Majesty.*

Sir John A. Macdonald never said – he could not possibly say – that as Prime Minister of Canada, under the new Constitution, he would have the right to advise the Sovereign on all matters within the exclusive constitutional jurisdiction of the Imperial Parliament, for instance respecting the exercise of the Royal prerogative of declaring war against, or of making peace with, a foreign independent State. He has never propounded such an utterly false constitutional doctrine.

Mr. Bourassa went still further. He quoted the following sentence from Sir John A. Macdonald: – "*We stand with regard to the people of Canada precisely in the same position as the House of Commons in England stands with regard to the people of England.*"

I was indeed most astonished to read Mr. Bourassa's inference from those words that Sir John A. Macdonald *had affirmed the absolute equality of powers of the Imperial and the Canadian Parliaments.*

If the opinion expressed by Sir John A. Macdonald could be so interpreted, he would have affirmed – what was radically wrong – that under the new Constitution, the Canadian Parliament would have, *concurrently with the Imperial Parliament*, absolutely the same powers. What did that mean? It meant that the Canadian Parliament, just as the Imperial Parliament, would have the right to edict laws establishing Home Rule in Ireland, regulating the government of India and the Crown Colonies, granting constitutional charters for the good government of the Australian

and South African Dominions, &c., &c.

Surely it is not necessary to argue at any length to prove that Sir John A. Macdonald never for a moment entertained such an opinion. What he really said, in the above quoted words, was that within their constitutional jurisdiction, within the limits of their respective powers, the two Parliaments stood in the same position, *respectively*, with regard to the people of England and to the people of Canada. It was equivalent to saying – what was positively true – that the British Ministers and the British Parliament were responsible to the people of England, and that the Canadian Ministers and the Canadian Parliament were responsible to the people of Canada, – both of them within the limits of their respective constitutional powers.

If the Canadian Legislature had enjoyed all the constitutional powers of the British Parliament, she would not have been obliged to pass addresses asking the latter to enact a new charter creating the Federal Union of the Provinces. She could have repealed her then existing constitution and enacted the new one by her own authority. But that she could not do. She could not repeal the old, nor enact the new charter.

But the most extraordinary is that Mr. Bourassa went so far as to declare that Canada should have participated in the present war only as a "*Nation*," meaning, of course, as an independent Sovereign State.

On reading such a preposterous proposition, at once it strikes one's mind most forcibly that if Canada had really had the power

to intervene in the world's struggle as a "Nation," she would have had the equal right to the choice of three alternatives.

First: – Declare war against Germany and in favor of the Allies.

Second: – Remain neutral.

Third: – Declare war against Great Britain and fight for Germany.

For it is obvious that all the Sovereign States – and Canada like them all if she had been one of them – had the Sovereign Right to fight for or against Great Britain, or to remain neutral. Of course, I am merely explaining in its entirety the Right of a Sovereign State. I surely do not mean to say that Canada, had she really been such a State, would in any way have been justifiable in joining with Germany in her dastardly attempt to crush Civilization in the barbarous throes of her domination.

What would His Excellency the Governor-General have answered his Prime Minister advising him to declare war against England, he who represents His Majesty at Ottawa? Would he not have told him at once that the Canadian Prime Minister had no right whatever to give him such an advice; that Canada, being a British Colony, could not declare war against her Sovereign State; that for the Canadian people to take up arms against England would be treasonable revolt?

It is absolutely incredible that a public man, aspiring to the leadership of his countrymen, can have been so completely lost to the sense of the Canadian constitutional situation as to boldly

attempt to pervert their mind with such fallacious notions. He might as well pretend that the State of New York, for instance, has the Sovereign Right to declare war against the Government of the United States.

I, for one, cannot help wondering that any one can seriously think that a colony, always pretending to remain loyally so, can wage war against her Sovereign State. I feel sure that all sensible men do share my views on that point.

CHAPTER VIII.

German Illusions

When Germany threw the gauntlet to the Powers of the "Entente," she labored under the delusion that the war would most surely break down the British Empire. She was determined to do her utmost to that end. But she utterly failed in her criminal efforts.

Strongly bound by ties of affection and constitutional freedom, the great autonomous Dominions and Colonies at once rallied with courage and patriotism to the defence of the Empire, of Justice, of Right and Civilization. India, – that great Indian Empire – to the utter disappointment of Germany, has stood admirably by Great Britain ever since the outbreak of the War, by her noble contributions of man-power and her munificent generosity of very large sums of money, in one instance amounting to \$500,000,000.

The Crown Colonies have also done their share of duty with great devotion.

The admirable result which for the last four years has been shining bright and glorious all over the world, is that, contrary to teutonic expectations, the war, far from breaking asunder the British Empire, has wonderfully solidified her mighty edifice, by an intensity of loyalty to her free institutions, to her glorious flag,

which the enjoyment of the blessings of peace would not have proved so easily possible.

CHAPTER IX.

The Nationalist Error

The leaders of our Nationalist School have for years strenuously laboured to pervert the mind of our French-Canadian compatriots by the false pretensions that we were, in some mysterious way, coerced to participate in the European War. Even previous to the days of the South African conflict, they boldly took the stand that Canada should, on no account, and under no circumstances whatever, participate in what they called the Wars of the Empire — *les guerres de l'Empire*. Canada, they affirmed, had only to defend her own territory if attacked.

Fully appreciating how insidious and dangerous such theories were, I endeavoured to show, as forcibly as I could, that there had been no attempt by England at coercion of this Dominion to help her in the struggle against Germany. Of course, as previously explained, Great Britain being at war with the German Empire, the whole British Empire was at war. But no one in England ever intended to propose to force the colonies to engage actively into the fight. The Imperial Parliament would certainly not have taken into consideration any such proposition.

But is it not plain and beyond discussion that we, *ourselves*, had the undoubted right to intervene in the war to the extent that we would consider it our bounden duty to do so?

Evidently we could not remain neutral in the great conflict. At the very moment that Great Britain was at war with Germany, Canada, a British Colony, was part and parcel of the belligerent Sovereign State, the British Empire. By an incredible misconception, the Nationalist leaders confounded *neutrality* with *non-participation* in the war, if we had so decided.

To be, or not to be, neutral, was not within our constitutional rights. If Germany, either by land or by sea, had attacked our territory, as she had the undoubted belligerent right to do, would it have availed us an iota to implore her mercy by affirming that we were neutral? Could we have pretended that she was violating neutral territory?

No one with the least notion of International Law would for a moment hesitate to give the true answers to those questions.

But the very different question to participate, or not, in the war, was for us alone to decide according to our constitutional charter. We have freely, deliberately, decided to do our share in the great war. We continue and persevere in our noble task, freely and deliberately.

It is admitted by all that under the actual constitutional organization of the Empire, the Imperial Parliament could not require the autonomous colonies to participate in the war. But no one can assuredly deny to that Parliament the right, in the case of an imminent peril, to formulate the desire that the autonomous colonies would help Great Britain to conjure the threatened calamity.

But, in the present case, the Imperial Parliament has not even been under the necessity of expressing such a legitimate wish, for the obvious reason that the colonies at once took their patriotic stand in favor of the cause of England and her Allies. If the colonies had not so decided, of their own free will, it is most likely that the Imperial Parliament would not have expressed the wish for the assistance of the Dominions overseas.

The hearty support granted by the colonies to Great Britain, to develop its full value, had to be spontaneous, enthusiastic. Such it was, such it is, and such it will be to the last day of the conflict which victorious conclusion we are so strongly determined to achieve.

CHAPTER X.

Had Canada The Right To Help England?

Not satisfied to do the best it could to persuade our French-Canadian countrymen that they had been coerced into the war by England, our "Nationalist School" extensively used the argument that Canada had not the right to intervene into the European struggle. I refuted this erroneous pretension by the following propositions, the very essence of our constitutional rights and liberties: —

1. – The Canadian Cabinet had the undoubted constitutional right to advise His Excellency the Governor-General to approve the measures to be taken to give effect to their decision to participate in the war, decision and measures for which they were responsible to the Canadian Parliament and to the Canadian Electorate.

2. – The Canadian Parliament had the undoubted constitutional right to approve or disapprove the decision and the measures of the Cabinet. Parliament approved that decision and those measures, acting within their constitutional right.

3. – Even at the time I was writing, it could evidently be affirmed that the Canadian Electorate had approved the stand taken by both the Canadian Cabinet and the Canadian Parliament

according to well known and defined constitutional usages.

Was it not proved beyond reasonable controversy, that the Canadian people heartily approved the decision of their Parliament to help in the great war?

Let me summarize the evidence as follows: —

1. — The war policy of the Cabinet, at the special session called in August, 1914, for that very purpose, was unanimously approved by Parliament, no Senator and no Member of the House of Commons moving to censure the responsible ministers for their decision to have Canada to participate in the war. The two great political parties have solemnly sanctioned that decision.

2. — Public opinion was also very strongly proved by the almost unanimity of the public press patriotically supporting the stand taken by Parliament. The exceptions were so few, that, as usual, they contributed to emphasize the soundness of the general rule.

3. — During the three years following the decision of the Canadian Parliament, a great number of large public meetings were held throughout Canada, and addressed by many leading and influential citizens all approving the action of Parliament. The meetings enthusiastically concurred in the powerful indorsation of the war policy of the speakers.

In a few public gatherings some disapproval was expressed, but not one meeting would go to the length of passing "Resolutions" censuring the Cabinet and the Parliament of Canada, or declaring that our Dominion should not have interfered into the war.

4. – Not one petition against the Canadian intervention into the war was addressed to Parliament.

5. – Leading Clergymen, of all denominations; leaders of political associations almost of all shades of opinion; financial, industrial, commercial leaders, all of them approved the patriotic interference of Canada into the war.

6. – The evident general approval of the unanimous decision, taken in 1916, to extend the Parliamentary term.

7. – The wonderful success of the public loans raised for war purposes.

8. – The enlightened and generous patriotism with which the country has accepted and paid war taxation.

9. – But, above all, the voluntary recruiting of four hundred thousand men of all social conditions who have rallied to the flag of the Empire for the defence of her existence and for the triumph of Civilization and Justice.

I, therefore, drew the undeniable conclusion that, contrary to the "Nationalist" pretension, Canada was participating in the war in the most regular constitutional way, without even the shadow of a breach of our Canadian autonomy, of our constitutional rights and liberties.

CHAPTER XI.

The Duty of Canada

Having affirmed that Canada had no right to interfere in the war, the "Nationalist" leaders at once concluded that she was not in duty bound to do so. That most discreditable inference was, of course, the natural sequence of the wrong principle aforesaid. They further drew the conclusion that it was no part of the duty of Canadians to join the Colors to help winning the war.

It was in flat contradiction of those erroneous notions that I positively declared, in my letter dedicating my book to my French Canadian compatriots, that "*in defending with the most sincere conviction the sacred cause of the Allies, I am doing my duty as a free subject of the British Empire, as a citizen of Canada and of the Province of Quebec, as a son of France, as a devoted servant of Justice and Right.*"

Very narrow minded indeed is the man who has no higher conception of his duty than the one limiting him to the observance of positive and negative laws enacted by the legitimate authority to protect society and every one of its members.

When England, together with the other leading nations, was brutally challenged by Germany, and threatened in her very national existence, it is beyond comprehension that Canada, and

all the British colonial possessions overseas, could so mistake their bounden duty as to refuse rushing to help the Mother Country in such a trying occurrence. Moreover, have we not, merely as men, duties to perform to protect Civilization against the deadly attack of barbarism, to have Justice and Right triumphant in international relations?

It is a matter of deep wonder to me that any one could have been so blind as not to perceive that in joining with Great Britain to defend the cause of the Allies, we were surely defending our own territory, our own soil, our own homes. How incredible was the "Nationalist" contention that we should have waited for the actual German attack of our land before mustering our resources of resistance. Who could not see, at a glance, that if Germany had, as it fully expected, easily triumphed over the combined forces of France, England and Russia, it would have been sheer madness to attempt resisting the victorious onslaught of a few hundred thousands of her veteran soldiers, whose valour would have been doubled by the enthusiasm of their European conquest.

After mature consideration of the possible results of the disastrous defeat of the combined efforts of the Allies, both on land and sea, the conclusion was forced upon my mind that Germany, ferociously elated by such a wonderful success, would no doubt have exacted from England the cession of Canada to her Empire. So that without even firing a gun against our territory, our wide Dominion would have been instantly transferred from the British to the German Sovereignty. I shuddered at such a

vision, and still more deeply realized how much we, Canadians, were all in duty bound to help the Allies in crushing Prussian militarism.

CHAPTER XII.

The Soudanese and South African Wars

In the two previously mentioned pamphlets, Mr. Bourassa argued at length to prove that Canada had been led to intervene in the great European war as a consequence of her intervention in the South African War. It is well known throughout the Dominion that the South African conflict was the occasion chosen by the "Nationalist" leader to proclaim his doctrine that the autonomous colonies should have nothing to do with the wars of the Empire – *les guerres de l'empire*. He then strongly opposed Canadian support of Great Britain in her struggle in South Africa.

In one of his pamphlets, Mr. Bourassa affirmed that the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald had, in 1884, refused the request of the Imperial Government to interfere in its favour in the Soudanese war. Well aware of the events of this struggle, I positively knew that the "Nationalist" leader's assertion was not borne out by the facts, and was historically false. I considered it my duty, in a special chapter, to explain fully the circumstances of the case to my French Canadian countrymen.

It should be well remembered that England was brought into the Soudanese conflict on account of her relations with Egypt,

which she had delivered from the Turkish yoke.

Mr. Bourassa prefaced his above mentioned affirmation by recalling the fact that it was in consideration of the Soudanese difficulties that "*for the first time in the history of the Colonial Empire of Great Britain, offers of armed support were made by the autonomous colonies.*"

Is it not evident that if – as was true – such offers were made spontaneously by the Colonies, it cannot be pretended that the proffered armed support was asked by England. If England did not solicit such support, it is plain that Sir John A. Macdonald and his Cabinet could not refuse what was never applied for.

What are the true historical facts?

In November 1884, General Laurie, who has represented one of the electoral divisions of Nova Scotia at Ottawa, who has also held a seat in the British House of Commons, took the initiative to propose to raise a Canadian regiment for the campaign in the Soudan. In the regular official way, General Laurie's offer was addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Derby. The Imperial Government declined the offer.

On the 7th of February, 1885, on hearing the news of the disaster of Khartoum, which caused great excitement in England, and naturally created a strong public feeling to avenge the outrage, General Laurie, always enthusiastic, tendered anew his services. He was not the only Canadian officer wishing to go and fight the cruel Soudanese. A member of the Canadian Parliament, Colonel Williams, commanding the 46th volunteer

battalion of Durham-East, also desired to take part in the African campaign with his regiment. On the 9th of February, 1885, he tendered his proposition to Sir Charles Tupper, then High Commissioner in London, who sent it to the Colonial Office.

On the 10th of February, His Excellency the Governor General, Lord Lansdowne, cabled to the Colonial Secretary that the offers of military service were very numerous. This spontaneous movement, so rapidly spreading, was the forerunner of those of 1899 and 1914. Thirty years ago, and long before, there were brave men in Canada. There always have been and ever will be.

These news were no doubt very encouraging for the Imperial authorities.

Lord Derby, thanking Lord Lansdowne, begged him to say "*Whether they (the offers of service) are sanctioned and recommended by the Dominion Government.*"

On the 12th of February, Lord Lansdowne answered Lord Derby that the Dominion Government was ready to approve recruiting in Canada for service in Egypt or elsewhere, provided that the men would be enlisted under the authority of the Imperial Army Discipline Act, and the expense paid by the Imperial Treasury.

It consequently follows from the above despatches that the Soudanese campaign offered to many officers of our volunteer Militia the long wished for opportunity to freely tender their services to the Imperial Government; that the British authorities

never applied to the Canadian Government, then presided by Sir John A. Macdonald, for armed support in Soudanese Africa; that, on being officially informed of the offers of service received by His Excellency the Governor General, the Colonial Secretary, before accepting or declining them, enquired if the Canadian Government sanctioned and recommended them; that the Governor General answered him in the affirmative, the recruiting to be made according to the Imperial Military Act at the expense of the Imperial exchequer.

On the 16th of February, the War Minister, then the Marquis of Hartington, informed the Colonial Secretary that he had come to the conclusion to decline with thanks the offers of service from Canada, for the reason that it would have taken too long a time to recruit and organize the regiments offered by General Laurie and Colonel Williams.

Was I not right, when I refuted Mr. Bourassa's assertion, in saying that if a *refusal* was *then* given, it was by the British Government who had received the freely tendered services, and not by the Canadian Government, to whom no demand of armed support had been made by Great Britain?

If it is indeed very astonishing that Mr. Bourassa should have taken the responsibility to affirm that the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald had refused to help Great Britain in the Soudanese campaign, it is easy to understand his object in so doing. His purpose was to convince his French Canadian readers that the political leaders at the head of the Government, in

1899 and 1914, together with the Canadian Parliament, had, in a revolutionary way, reversed the traditional policy of Canada of non-intervention in the "wars of the Empire" —*les guerres de l'empire*. And to achieve his end, so detrimental to the best interests of the Dominion, he did not hesitate to draw an absolutely erroneous conclusion from undeniable historical facts.

The "Nationalist" leader was very anxious to charge the chieftains of the two great political parties with an equal responsibility for what he terms a "Revolution" in our relations with the Mother Country. With this object constantly in view, he pretended that the intervention of Canada in the South African War created the precedent which brought about the Dominion participation in the European war, in 1914. In order to stir up to the utmost the prejudices of the French Canadians, he boldly qualified the South African conflict as an *infamous crime* on the part of England.

Unfortunately, the true history of the difficulties which culminated in the Boer War of 1899, was at the time little known throughout Canada, and even less particularly in the Province of Quebec. At the outbreak of the struggle, wishing to form a sound opinion of the causes of which it was the direct outcome, I made an exhaustive study of the South African question, beginning at the very inception of the Dutch settlement dating as far back as 1652, the year during which the Dutch East India Company occupied Table Bay. Six years later, in 1658, French Huguenots reached South Africa, joining with the Dutch Reformists, who

rather energetically did all they could to assimilate them. Still later on, besides some few German immigrants, a third group of Europeans settled on the African coast. They were Englishmen.

All the Europeans, on landing in South Africa, few in numbers, had at once to contend with the black race numbering many millions. The history of the long struggle between European civilization, represented by the English and Dutch immigrants, and African barbarity, is indeed very interesting. Carefully read and studied in all its bearings, it strongly impressed upon my mind the conviction that had it not been for the timely armed protection they often solicited and received from England, the Dutch Boers would certainly have been annihilated by the tribes of the black race. They could not hope to successfully resist the onslaughts to which they were repeatedly submitted. They were saved from utter destruction by the strong arm of Great Britain, occupying an important strategical position by her Cape Colony. The British Government had favoured the settlement of the sons of England in South Africa, for the purpose of assuring, by a powerful naval station, the freedom of communication with the great regions soon to develop into her vast Indian Empire.

How, and under what circumstances, was British Sovereignty established in South Africa? I considered this question the most important to ascertain, in order to judge fairly the history of the last century in those regions. It was settled by the Peace Congress of Vienna, in 1815. All the European nations represented at that

congress, have sanctioned British Sovereignty in South Africa upon the condition of the payment by England to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, of which Holland was then a part, of the sum of \$30,000,000. Consequently the Sovereign Rights of Great Britain in South Africa were henceforth undeniable.

In my French book, I somewhat extensively summarized the development of the British and Dutch groups of settlers in South Africa. It is well known that the Boers are of Dutch origin. That a rivalry did develop between the two national elements, is not to be wondered at by any one having some knowledge of the history of the world.

I do not consider it necessary to go at any length in relating the vicissitudes of the conflict between the aspirations of the Boer element and the undoubted rights of British suzerainty. As a rule they are sufficiently well known by my English readers.

But I wish to emphasize the two undeniable facts: first, that throughout this protracted contest, England did perseveringly try to favour South Africa with the largest possible measure of political liberty. Second, that the crisis was finally brought about by the persistent determination of the Government of Pretoria to refuse justice to the Uitlanders and to the British capitalists who, at the urgent request of President Kruger, had invested many millions in the development of the very valuable mines recently discovered in the Transvaal territory.

Though England had agreed to the establishment of the two Republics of the Transvaal and Orange, she had maintained her

suzerainty on those territories, which suzerainty the Government of Pretoria had again recognized by the Convention of 1884.

The most convincing proof that England did not intend any unfair design against the South African Republics, is the fact that she did not prepare to resist the armed attack of the Government of Pretoria which could be easily foreseen by the intense organization they were evidently making to impose Boer supremacy in South Africa.

In his very unjust appreciation of the policy of Great Britain in South Africa, Mr. Bourassa kept no account whatever of the very important fact that war was declared against England by the South African Republic. How could Great Britain have been guilty of a hideous crime in not bowing to the dictate of President Kruger and his Government, as the "Nationalist" leader said, is beyond comprehension.

England was absolutely within her right in accepting the challenge of the Government of Pretoria, and fighting to maintain her flag and her Sovereignty in South Africa.

Fortunately, the South African War, characterized by deeds of heroism on both sides, has had the most satisfactory conclusion. It is to be hoped that for many long years the future of that great country is settled with all the blessings that political liberty and free institutions will surely confer on that important part of the British Empire. The Boers themselves have fully recognized that their own national development cannot be better guaranteed and safeguarded than by the powerful Sovereignty pledged to their

protection, on the only condition of their loyal allegiance to the flag waving on the fair land where they can multiply in peace, prosperity and happiness. The enthusiasm and the admirable courage with which they have rallied to the support of Great Britain and her Allies in the present war, is the best evidence how much they appreciate the advantages of their new conditions in the great South African Dominion destined to such a grand future.

I most sincerely deplore the persistent efforts of the "Nationalist" leader to pervert more and more the mind of my French Canadian countrymen by his so very unfair appreciation of the nature of the South African conflict. It was with the hope of counteracting them that I introduced a special chapter in my French edition explaining, as fully as I could, though in a condensed form, the South African question.

The assertion that the participation of Canada in the present European war was the sequence of the precedent of our intervention in the South African struggle, is also most unjustifiable and untenable. Had Canada taken no part whatever in the South African War, it would not have made the least difference with regard to the decision of the Canadian people to support Great Britain and the Allies in their gigantic effort to put an end to Prussian terrorism. The assertion which I most emphatically contradict could have no other object but to prejudice the public mind against Canadian intervention in any of the wars of the Empire —*les guerres de l'empire*.

CHAPTER XIII.

British and German Aspirations Compared

In the attempt to justify his opposition to the Canadian armed support of the Allies' cause, Mr. Bourassa repeatedly asserted that Great Britain was as much as Germany aspiring to rule the whole world. He pretends that there is no difference between Anglo-Saxonism and Germanism.

How unjust and dangerous is such a doctrine is evident to any fair minded man. It was no doubt calculated to prejudice the French Canadians against Great Britain, by telling them that the sacrifices they were called upon to make were imposed upon them only to favour the British determination to reach the goal of her ambition: – universal domination.

I strongly repudiated such assertions and vindicated England's course and policy.

To accuse Great Britain to aspire to universal domination is a most unwarranted charge, contradicted by the whole history of the last century during which she was the most determined supporter of peace.

Though one of the great Powers of the world, England never undertook to organize a large standing army. How could she aspire to the world's domination without a complete military

organization comprising many millions of men, is what I am unable to understand.

Mr. Bourassa's argument to prove his assertion is based on the efforts of England to maintain and develop her naval forces so as to guarantee her supremacy on the high seas of the world. How he failed to realize that Great Britain, on account of her insular position, close to the European continent, is by nature itself bound, of sheer necessity, to protect herself by the strength of her military naval power, is beyond comprehension. Supremacy on the seas is for the Mother Country a mere question of national existence, – to be or not to be. But supremacy on the seas cannot, and will never, permit England to attain anything like universal domination. And why? For the obvious reason that Great Britain is not, and never can become, a continental Power, in the exact sense of the word.

I explained, conclusively, I believe, that the case would be very different if Germany succeeded in her efforts to supplant England's supremacy on the seas. When the Berlin Government undertook to build a huge military fleet, Germany was the greatest continental military Power. What were her expectations when she adopted that threatening naval policy? The Berlin authorities were very confident that when they would decide to bring on the great war for which they had been strenuously preparing for half a century, they would in a few months have continental Europe at their feet and under their sway. Triumphant over Europe they would have at once dominated Asia and a great

part of Africa. The next surest way for the German Empire to reach universal domination was to break England's power on the seas. What is impossible for England to accomplish, on account of her insular position, Germany, being a continental Empire, could achieve if she became mistress of the seas.

The present war is the proof evident that the mighty power of England on the seas has been the salvation of her national existence and, almost equally, that of France and Italy. It kept the oceans open for the trade of all the Allied and neutral nations. He is willingly blind, intellectually, the man who does not see that deprived of the matchless protection of her naval forces, Great Britain could be starved and subdued in a few months by an enemy ruling the waves against her.

Is it possible to suppose that any man aspiring to help moulding the public opinion of his countrymen, ignores that with the relatively small extent of the territory it can devote to agricultural production, Great Britain can never feed her actual population of over forty-five millions, most likely to reach sixty millions in the not very distant future. Consequently how unjust, how extravagant, is it to accuse England of any aspiration to dominate the world by means of the sacrifices she is absolutely bound to make for the only sake of her self-defence, her self-protection.

If he does not know, I will no doubt cordially oblige the "Nationalist" leader by informing him that Great Britain, usually importing food products to the amount of seven to eight hundred

millions of dollars, for many years past, required as much as a billion dollars worth of them in the war year of 1915. It is so easy to foresee that the continual increase of the population of the United Kingdom, by the new large developments which will surely follow the war in all industrial, commercial and financial pursuits, will cause a relative increase in the importations of food products likely to reach, and even exceed before long, an average total annual value of a billion and a quarter dollars.

None of the European continental Powers has the same imperious reasons as England to take the proper means to guarantee her control of the seas. How is it then that Germany is the only Power to object to England's policy, if it is not for the ultimate object to attain universal domination by the overthrow of Great Britain's ascendancy on the wide oceans, which would permit her to realize her long cherished aim by the combined powerful effort of her gigantic military forces both on land and sea.

With regard to England's naval supremacy, the "Nationalist" leader is also committed to other opinions which I strongly contradicted. He entirely forgets that beyond the sea coast limits, well defined by International Law, no Sovereign rights can be claimed on the high seas. The navigation of the ocean is free to all nations by nature itself. Has any Government ever entertained the foolish idea that the broad Atlantic could, for instance, be divided into so many parts as the European, Asiatic, or American continents, over which several States could exercise Sovereign

powers? No Chinese Wall can be built on the seas.

My own view of the case, which I believe to be the correct one, is that England's naval supremacy means nothing more nor less than the police of the seas, and the protection of the flags of all the Nations navigating them, besides being, of course and necessarily, the guarantee of her National existence.

Blind also, intellectually, is the British subject not sufficiently inspired by the true sense of the duties of Loyalty, who does not understand that once Great Britain's maritime power would be crushed and the United Kingdom either conquered or obliged to an humiliating peace which would ruin all her future prospects, the Colonial Empire would equally be at the mercy of the victorious enemy of the Mother Country.

With the most earnest conviction, I have tried, to the best of my ability, to persuade my French-Canadian compatriots of the inevitable dangers ahead if the false views which were so persistingly impressed upon their minds were ever to prevail, and the aim they undoubtedly favour to be realized.

Another argument widely used by our "Nationalist" School to influence the opinion of the French Canadians against Canada's participation in the war, was that Great Britain herself was not doing what she ought to win the victory. I have personally heard this false objection repeated by many – unconsciously of course – who were influenced in so saying by the "Nationalist" press.

No more unfair charge could have been made against England. I could not help being indignant at reading it, knowing as I

did, by daily acquired information what an immense effort the United Kingdom had been making, from the very beginning of the hostilities, to play its powerful part in the great war into which it had nobly decided to enter to avenge its honour, to defend the Empire and the whole world against German barbarous militarism.

I have already commented on the immense service guaranteed to the Allied nations by the British fleet. To illustrate the wonderful and admirable military effort of Great Britain, I will quote some very important figures from the most interesting Report of the British War Cabinet, for the year 1917, presented to Parliament by Command of His Majesty.

Under the title "*Construction and Supply*" the Report says: —

During the past year the Naval Service has undergone continual expansion in order to enable it to meet every demand made upon it, not only in the seas surrounding these islands, but in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, the Arctic Ocean, the Pacific, and the Atlantic, where it has co-operated with the Naval forces of the Allies. The displacement tonnage of the Royal Navy in 1914 was 2,400,000 tons. To-day it has increased by 75 per cent. (— **making a total of 4,200,000 tons** —). The ships and vessels of all kinds employed in the Naval Service in September, 1914, after the whole of the mobilisation had been completed, had a tonnage of just over 4 million; now the figure is well over 6 million. Transports, fleet attendants and overseas oilers and similar auxiliary vessels

at the outbreak of war numbered 23; the Admiralty to-day control nearly 700 such craft. The strength of the personnel, which was 145,000, has been increased to 420,000.

From these brief particulars regarding the ships and their manning, an estimate can be formed of the expansions that have been made in the auxiliary services, such as guns, torpedoes, munitions, and stores of all kinds, anti-submarine apparatus, mines, &c., and some idea is gained of the demands that have been made upon the great army of workers on shore, the men in the Royal dockyards and arsenals, in the shipyards, the engine shops, and the factories, without whose help the Fleet could not be maintained as a fighting force.

As regards warship and auxiliary ship construction, the output during the last 12 months has been between three and four times the average annual output for the few years preceding the war.

The Admiralty now control all the dry docks in the country... – 250 merchant ships are being repaired each week, either in dry dock or afloat.

Since the beginning of the war, 31,470 British war vessels have been placed in dock or on the slips (– **as many as 225 being repaired in one week** –)... These figures do not include repair work carried out to the vessels of our Allies...

The Transport Service is of the highest importance in carrying on the war. What has been the achievement of England on that score? Under the title: – "*Transportation*" the War Cabinet

Report proves its immensity as follows: —

The record of what has been done by the transport services for the Armies of the Allies shows a stupendous amount of work accomplished, which constitutes one of the brilliant achievements of the war. There had been transported overseas up till the end of August, 1917, the last date for which complete statistics are available — some: — 13 million human beings — combatants, wounded, medical personnel, refugees, prisoners, &c.; 2 million horses and mules; 1/2 million vehicles; 25 million tons of explosive and supplies for the armies; ... 51 million tons of coal and oil fuel for the use of our Fleets, our Armies, and to meet the needs of our Allies.

The operations of the seas are on such a large scale that it is difficult to realize all that is involved in sea transportation; for example, over 7,000 personnel are transported, and more than 30,000 tons of stores and supplies have to be imported daily into France for the maintenance of our own army. About 567 steamers, of approximately 1 3/4 million tons, are continually employed in the service of carrying troops and stores to the Armies in France and to the forces in various theatres of war in the East.

We all know that the Berlin Government expected that the submarine campaign would result in an early final victory for the Central Empires. Herr von Bethmann Hollweg, then the Imperial Chancellor, said: — "*The Blockade must succeed within a limited number of weeks, within which America cannot effectively participate in the operations.*"

How he was mistaken, and extravagant were his expectations, events have proved. This sentence is also proof evident that he realized how effective the United States effort would become, if the submarine campaign did not succeed within a few weeks.

The iniquitous submarine campaign, re-opened early in the year 1917, "*added materially to the responsibilities of the Navy. To meet this new and serious menace drastic steps had to be taken to supplement those adopted in the previous December and January.*"

The Report adds: —

A large number of new destroyers have been built and at the same time auxiliary patrol services have been expanded enormously so as to deal with the nefarious submarine and minelaying methods of the enemy. Before the outbreak of the war there were under 20 vessels employed as minesweepers and on auxiliary patrol duties. To-day the number of craft used for these purposes at home and abroad is about 3,400, and is constantly increasing.

A new feature of the means adopted for the protection of trade against submarines has been a return to the convoy system as practised in bygone wars. It has been markedly effective in reducing the losses. During the last few months over 90 per cent. of all vessels sailing in all the Atlantic trades were convoyed...

The Royal Naval Air Service at the outbreak of war possessed a personnel of under 800; at the present moment the numbers approach 46,000 and are continually increasing... Mention must also be made of the great value

of the air services in combating the submarine menace round our coasts... Illustrating their extent it may be stated that in one week the aircraft patrol round the British coasts alone flies 30,000 miles.

The general result of the German attack, therefore, though serious enough, is far from unprecedented. In the two years after Trafalgar, when our command of the sea was unquestioned, we still lost 1,045 merchant ships by capture, and in the whole period from 1794 to 1875 we lost over 10,000 merchant ships.

Nor should we lose sight of the very heavy losses sustained by the enemy in the present war. At the commencement of hostilities, Germany had 915 merchant ships abroad, of which only 158 got home safely; the remainder within a few days were cleared from the oceans, either captured or driven to shelter in neutral ports. In the aggregate the German Mercantile Marine consisted of over 5 million tons of shipping; at the present time nearly half of this has been sunk or captured by ourselves or our Allies, while the bulk of the rest is lying useless in harbour.

Let me now refer to the military effort of Great Britain. Under the title: – "*Strength of the Army*," &c., the War Cabinet Report gives the following most inspiring figures.

The effort which the British nations have made under the one item of "Provision of Men for the Armed Forces of the Crown" amounts to not less than 7,500,000 men, and of these 60.4 per cent. have been contributed by England, 8.3 per cent. by Scotland, 3.7 per cent. by Wales, 2.3 per

cent. by Ireland, 1.2 per cent. by the Dominions and the Colonies, while the remainder, 13.3 per cent., composed of native fighting troops, labour corps, carriers, &c., represent the splendid contribution made by India and our various African and other Dependencies.

Royal Artillery.— The personnel of the Royal Artillery increased 17.6 per cent., between August, 1916, and August, 1917.

In the first nine months of 1917 the supply of modern anti-aircraft guns in the field increased 44 per cent., that of field guns 17 per cent., of field-howitzers 26 per cent., of heavy guns 40 per cent., of medium howitzers 104 per cent., of heavy howitzers 16 per cent., and of heavy-guns on railway mountings 100 per cent.; these last have an increased range of about 35 per cent... We have also supplied large numbers of heavy guns and trench mortars to our Allies in different theatres of war.

The Medical Service has continued to expand with the growth of the Army and its strength is now largely in excess of our whole original Expeditionary Force... More than 17,000 women are employed as nurses and over 28,000 others are engaged in military hospitals on various forms of work... Hospitals in the United Kingdom now number more than 2,000.

The health of the troops in the United Kingdom is actually better than the peace rate; the same is the case in France, excluding admissions to hospital by reason of wounds.

The above quoted figures prove that out of a total of

7,500,000 men for the Armed Forces of the British Crown, Great Britain – the United Kingdom – had contributed, at the end of last year, 5,625,000, out of which number the shore of England and Wales amounted to 4,800,000. The British Colonial Empire's contribution had been 1,875,000.

At the date of the current year – August, 1918 – I am writing, I can safely calculate that the number of men for the Armed Forces of the British Crown – using the words of the Official Report above quoted – has reached, at least, *the grand and magnificent total of 8,000,000*. The percentage of respective contributions of the United Kingdom and the Colonial Empire no doubt remaining the same, the relative number of each of them is, – for the United Kingdom 6,000,000; for the Colonies 2,000,000.

I consider the War Cabinet Report of 1917 so interesting, so encouraging, that my readers will, I am confident, kindly bear with me in a few more very important quotations, the full Report itself having had only a very limited circulation in Canada.

Transport

In addition to the prodigious Naval effort of England, both military and mercantile, previously illustrated, Great Britain has most powerfully contributed to the fighting operations on land by an immense improvement in transportation facilities by railway construction in all British theatres of war.

The Report says: —

In all these theatres railways have come to play a more and more important part. In France a vast light railway system has been created, involving the supply during the present year of approximately 1,700 miles of track and the whole of the equipment... Exclusive of these light railway systems, the total amount of permanent railway track supplied complete to all theatres of war is about 3,600 miles. In Egypt the railway crossing the desert from the Suez Canal has now reached and passed Gaza. In Mesopotamia the rapid and successful movements of our troops have only been made possible by the construction of a whole series of lines since the beginning of 1917. The development of road-building has been on a similar scale, and the shipments of material, equipment and stores for these two purposes during the last nine months have averaged 200,000 tons a month. Much labour has also been spent in the organisation of an Overland Line of Communication through France and Italy to the Mediterranean in order to save shipping. This line was opened for personnel traffic in June, 1917, and for goods traffic early in August.

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.