

# WHO IS STABBING CANADA'S SOLDIERS IN THE BACK?

## DISLOYAL LEADERS IN QUEBEC

### The Old Dream of French Independence Again

#### Anti-British Agitators Waiting for Solid Quebec With Aim of Dominating Canadian Affairs

What has happened to the French-Canadians? It was the proud boast of one of their leaders in times gone by—that it was not Sir George Etienne Cartier who said it—that: "The last gun in defence of British connection would be fired by a French-Canadian."

Some of them under the brave De Salaberry did good work in the war of 1812 at Chateauguay, when by a clever ruse the invaders were made to believe that a heavy force was facing them, and scampered back home by the Lake Champlain route.

La Croix (The Cross) a French-Canadian paper, gives hospitality in its columns to the following:

"Go on advocating the secession of Canada. In it lies the salvation of our race and the realization of the magnificent dream of Champlain. The time has come to work towards a new political constitution. The Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces autonomous is what we should have had for fifty years. We would then have kept our population, we would have managed a clean immigration, and we would have exploited our natural resources to the profit of our kin. Today we would be numerous and strong. But it is not too late. What we have to do first is to separate from Confederation. This obtained, the organization of our new Dominion would be easy."

Does this mean that Cartier's French-Canadian would be the last to fire a gun in defence of British connection?

One-half of the French-Canadian nationality has emigrated to the United States, where neither French language, religion or law has official recognition, as in Canada. And we are told by U. S. recruiting officers that of this million and a half of people the proportion offering for the war is greater than that even of the native United States citizens!

What has happened to our French-Canadians? The Premier of Quebec is with them, he says, in opposing the Military Service act. So are most of their political leaders—openly refusing to support our troops from the ranks of their people, actually opposing the war in which their fellow citizens are defending Canadian nationality, the existence of France, and the very life of our Empire, against the most powerful enemy time has ever brought to oppose civilization and national rights!

A few days ago Bernier, a mob agitator, said in Montreal that he would not retract a single word he had said against conscription or the British royal family. It was a farce for England to claim that it was a war for civilization and democracy as long as there was a king at the head of affairs. There was only one country a man should be willing to die for, and that was his own.

Ferdinand Villeneuve, another agitator at the same meeting, thought all should be revolutionaries to see that Canadian interests were looked after. We should say: "To hell with winning the war until we have saved our country."

The French-Canadian Mayor of Montreal is trying to whip his co-religionists into fury by claiming most absurdly that he sees the hand of the Orangemen and Free Masons of Ontario in the Military Service Bill. After the war the United States would want some recompense for going to war, and this, according to his ridiculous argument, would be the Province of Quebec, if not the whole of Canada. "Perhaps this will mean that we will not be able to speak our language in Parliament; but we are insulted now by these immigrants that we brought over from the other side, and if we are annexed we will have the right to practice our religion. We are being insulted by these bandits and hypocrites."

Sixty-five French-Canadian votes would be very useful to an aspirant for party leadership!

They might indeed swing parliamentary decisions. But probably the end desired would be attained if it placed in the saddle at Ottawa Sir Wilfrid Laurier's successor in the leadership of the French-speaking members of Parliament.

#### THE MAN ON HORSEBACK.

Who in such a case would be "The Man on Horseback"?

Henri Bourassa? Bourassa, who stands for the separation of Canada from the British Empire, and from all British influence?

It is not at least remarkable that Bourassa has at this juncture publicly announced the re-marriage of his Nationalism with Sir Wilfrid's party?

It has already come to pass when it is openly recognized that although he is too valuable to his party to drop him now, Sir Wilfrid is to yield his leadership to another as soon as his election usefulness has gone.

Is it because a more vigorous policy is to be inaugurated by the "only real Canadians" under Bourassa's management, as soon as the opportunity offers? Is the present agitation excited by the feeling that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's leadership has brought French-Canadians into too intimate a connection with the British "immigrants we brought over from the other side"?

Is not the whole thing political, merely aiming at sending a "solid French-Canadian" delegation to rule the next Parliament?

The man who heads the party professing such tenets, Henri Bourassa, has now openly acknowledged that he is at one with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that they together head not two separate bodies, but one united party.

None were more loyal to the cause of United Canada as a constituent part of the great British Empire than were French-Canadians once upon a time.

And now even the wily Bourassa dares to come out to gain the applause of his compatriots by declaring that not Mercier's well known dream in the 'Eighties of a French Republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence, but an independent Republic, fathered, of course, by French-Canadians of the whole of Canada, is his aim!

Has the success of French-Canadianism in politics, school and religious matters gone to the heads of these gentlemen?

English-speaking Canada has never had any but kindly thought and consideration for the French-speaking parts. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir George Etienne Cartier, two of their great tribunes, ever found generous support from their English friends.

#### WHAT HAS LED THEM AWAY?

What quest has set French-Canada off into the sorry wilderness of hatred of Britain, opposition to all things English, and a desire to push on the solely French feature of our nationality?

When Vaureuil surrendered Canada to General Amherst on September 8, 1760, he asked that the Articles of Capitulation should state that "The French-Canadians, and Acadians of what state and condition soever, who shall remain in the Colony, shall not be forced to take arms against his most Christian Majesty, or his Allies, directly or indirectly, on any occasion whatsoever; the British Government shall only require of them an exact neutrality."

Amherst replied in his soldierly, straight-forward way: "They become Subjects of the King" (of England) and so the Articles of Capitulation were made to read. (Article XII.)

In a former Article (XXXVI) it had been agreed that any who wished to do so might leave Canada for France, and would be granted transportation by the British. Naturally those who desired to remain were held to have signified their intention of relinquishing French and assuming British citizenship.

#### TREATY OF PARIS.

Subsequently in February 1763, the Treaty of Paris, under which Canada was formally ceded to Britain stipulated (Article IV) "His Britannic Majesty, on his side, agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada; he will in consequence give the most precise and effective orders, that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Roman Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit."

Exactly the same stipulation was made in the same Treaty with regard to the Spanish possessions ceded at the same time to Great Britain.

There was not a word in the Capitulations or in the Treaty about



the equal use of the French language in Canada, nor about the establishment of French civil law!

Why are French street orators today under the inspiration of Henri Bourassa and his friends, permitted to claim that "Our language, our religion, our law," were granted us by "solemn treaties"?

How is it that not a single voice is raised among these Nationalists to show that refusal to serve in war as British subjects is causing thoughtful men to enquire: "Where did French-Canada acquire its special privilege of language, religion, and law? If by treaty, they must remain; and we have to make the best of it." If by act of Parliament only, what one law enacts, another can disallow."

This principle has been laid down recently by street orators in our Province with regard to the Conscription Bill. "What the present Parliament decrees, the next may disallow."

#### TERMS OF CONFEDERATION.

In approaching the Throne, with a request for the Confederation of Canada, the representatives of the Canadian people laid down their desire in the following terms:

"The executive authority or government shall be vested in the Sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and be administered according to the well-understood principles of the British constitution, by a Sovereign personally, or by the representative of the Sovereign duly authorized."

Accordingly the British North America Bill of March, 27, 1867, was introduced into the British Parliament and duly passed; its preamble reading:

"Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion, under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom;

"And whereas such a union would conduce to the welfare of the provinces and promote the interests of the British Empire," etc. etc.

Great French-Canadian leaders, Cartier, Tache, Chapais and Langevin, were in agreement with the framing of these loyal declarations.

Time had brought home to them the need of the great British Empire and given them an anxiety to promote its interests.

What has brought about a change in the feelings of French-Canada, so that its leaders today did not start such a recruiting campaign for the war to which Canada and the Empire were perforce committed, as would have filled the ranks of our armies long ago with volunteers?

#### FOR INDEPENDENCE OF CANADA.

A new ambition has taken hold of French-Canadians.

An article in Le Devoir (The Duty), Henri Bourassa's organ, the other day, defiantly asserted "that Bourassa, like Laurier formerly, has simply declared that the independence of Canada, and not of the single province of Quebec, seemed to him the natural end of our national evolution! . . ."

"It assuredly does not suit those who would give as the first object of the aspirations and sacrifices of Canada the interest of England or of another country; but it depends no more on them than on us to make the unity of a people in one country other than that of real patriotism. Neither does it suit those who would make of this country a one-language country, since we are not obliged to kill ourselves in order to please them."

How would one account for such an utterance as the following, flamboyantly displayed in Le Journal de Waterloo?

"Si l'on combat l'autre Cote pour la liberte des petits peuples, la premiere ligne de tranchee pour les Canadiens-francais n'est pas dans les Flandres mais sur la frontiere de l'Ontario."

In English this runs:

"If we must fight on the other side for the liberty of small nations, the first line of trenches for the French-Canadians is not in Flanders but on the frontier of Ontario."

L'Action Francaise recently had an article by Abbe Lionel Groulx which expresses boldly the feeling of some of his compatriots towards British and other immigrants.

"Instead of bringing together the oldest inhabitants of our land," he complains, "our political leaders have thought better to allow our country to be invaded by hordes from abroad, preference being given to Americans and English from the British Isles. The first change the country, without changing their allegiance and become most active in American penetration, while the second, hypnotized by the Mother Country, cannot but jeopardize the progress of our autonomy. . . ."

"Today, while we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, hypocritical allusion is made to peace and unity, yet every French minority is on the defensive and has to fight not only for its right, but for the supreme right of existence. How then is it possible to love one's country and not be pained and indignant before all the stupidities of these small politicians, who have ruined our hopes? Obligated to defend our positions against a people with Protestant morals, one might as well say German morals, we have passed our time playing with big words devoid of generosity and British fair play, and today the evil is profound and incurable, and the situation appears to be without issue."

Everyone knows how seriously the French-Canadians take their politics and how easily they are led, but how came it about that such hatred of the British people and Empire has been engendered in their hearts?

Under their knightly leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, they have become more united under one political banner than was formerly the case. But why so anti-British as soon as trouble broke out for Great Britain?

Who taught that to these usually placid, and always docile, people?

Today the aspirant to leadership in Quebec Province is Henri Bourassa. Like Mercier a French orator, adroit, agile in argument, an object of worship almost to the nationalistic French-Canadian, a determined opponent of British Imperialism, a pacifist, in opposition to any Canadian participation in the war, Bourassa will be the natural heir to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as he marches to Ottawa the possessor of from sixty to eighty safe French seats in the House of Commons!

Is this what the Quebec Province agitators are looking forward to? Are they preparing their usually docile French-speaking fellow-citizens for what will follow the next election?

And is the dream of a new independent all-French Canada being displayed as a mere will o' the wisp to lead on to a solid French vote to gain a political party victory, and then to be dropped as a bit of baggage required no longer?

#### The German World Intrigue

The accomplishments of German agents in the domestic politics of Russia and Italy of late have called attention rather dramatically to one of Germany's favorite methods of gaining her ends. Proof now exists connecting the German Government of conspiracies designed to influence political conduct in five Allied nations, Russia, Italy, Greece, France and the United States, and no one pretends that the whole truth is known.

In Great Britain, German interference may be traced to antebellum days, when, for example, Mr. I. T. T. Lincoln, who tried to inform Germany of the location of the British fleet just after war began, was an uncompromising pacifist member of Parliament, enthusiastic for any reform that meant the weakening of the nation.

The story of German intrigue in American politics is not yet fully told, but documentary evidence is in existence to prove that von Bernstorff expended money by the thousands for the direct purpose of influencing the United States Congress.

It is not to be argued before an unprejudiced audience that the Government which had machinery in existence when war began to attempt the corruption of political life in many different nations, far and wide, as a part of its war policy, came into possession of this potent force for the furtherance of its military aims by accident. On the other hand, the evidence is conclusive, that Germany, before the war, had in readiness for instant operation, a huge, world-wide machine, designed for the sole purpose of weakening the opposition to the German march to world power.

This being so, it is patent that the democratic nations are greatly handicapped in their struggle with European autocracy, so far as political instrumentalities are concerned. At the moment, Russia naturally furnishes the "awful example," having gone from one extreme to the other; but in every Allied nation it is possible today for the German Government to throw its influence indiscreetly in favor of whatever action suits its purpose. We have no evidence that the world-wide machinery of corruption and intrigue has broken down, and much convincing testimony that it is today well-oiled and just as efficient as ever.

As to what part of the German scheme calls for direct bribery of the corruptible, and what part is devoted to ingenious backing of convenient political enterprises innocently conceived and carried on by political leaders of apparent integrity, there is no definite information available. But it is not the German habit to spend money where none is needed to accomplish Prussian ends. Rather is it the practice to accept without thanks such aid as comes unsolicited and to devote the funds released by unpaid service to more embarrassing and difficult projects. It follows that those who do enemy service innocently do greater harm than those who work for pay, apart from their lack of guilt.

The people of no Allied country at war with Germany can afford to overlook the significance of numerous exposures which have proved the existence of a German world development in the Allied nations. Ever present in the thoughts of those who contemplate the political situation in any Allied country, should be a clear understanding of the dangers raised by enemy interference, which lurks on every side in one form or another.

"What would the Kaiser do?" is a ready test to be applied to political decisions, and in view of the amazing extent of the German conspiracy, its forms of disguise and its methods of operation, a necessary test. The spectacle of patriotic citizens misled into supporting political action which goes to assist the enemy, is not pleasant to contemplate, yet this has been witnessed time and again in several Allied countries. Surely the time has come to speak out against a hideous and ever-present menace to our institutions which since the war began has weighed in the balance directly in favor of the brutal assaults of civilization.

## BOURASSA AND WHAT HE WANTS

### Anti-British Agitator Joins Hands With Laurier

#### Hatred for Britain and Desire for Separation is the Key-note of His Nationalist Policy

Henry Bourassa is the recognized leader of the French Nationalist party in Quebec.

He has recently declared himself and his party in support of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his supporters in this election.

This means, of course, that he finds the aims and policies of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in this election to be in accord with his own. What are the aims and ideals of Henri Bourassa?

Read the following extracts from his writings and speeches:

Speaking at meeting 10,000 French Canadians at Monument National, Montreal, on October 20, 1910, Mr. Bourassa said:

"I continue to believe that Canada owes nothing to England, that Canada has paid all her debts to England; that if Canada was separated from Great Britain, tomorrow the British taxpayers could not cut down a farthing of their taxes, could not dispense with one of their warships and could not retrench in their expenditures for defence, for, if they maintain their army and their navy, it is not for the security of Canada that they do so, it is for the safety of their daily bread, for their country cannot produce wheat enough to nourish inhabitants for three months; for they could not keep in their storehouse sufficient wheat to keep the English people alive for six months and consequently England, were she separated from Canada tomorrow, would need all her warships in order to keep open the seas over which she receives her daily bread and the raw material for her industries."

In interview given in Boston, January 21, 1913, Bourassa said:

"We would much rather undergo natural development of independence under the Nationalist idea than to have constant friction, disagreement, and distrusts under imperialism. Independence is the moral outcome of any colony."

Speaking at annual dinner of McMaster University Literary Society, Toronto on Feb. 27, 1914, Mr. Bourassa said:

"It is a delusion to think that Englishmen consider us a sovereign nation. In the English mind, whatever one may say about the English tongue, we are still a country dominated by England, Englishmen are not yet ready to admit that Canadians are their equals. Yet in Canada we exercise potentially a nation's rights. The time must come when we will demand recognition of our lawful position amongst the nations of the world."

On October 19, 1915 Le Devoir published article by Mr. Bourassa in part as follows:

"Of all the stupidities which have been heard during the last year none has been more complete than that which attributes the unpreparedness of the English army to the love of peace and the horror of conquest. The truth is that England for a century has made or provoked more wars, conquered more territories, pillaged more people than any other power in the world. But all these wars, save the Crimea where she assured herself of the help of France, she has undertaken people who are incapable of fighting against her. All these conquests have been made in view of investment of capital, of the feeding of her industries, of the enlargement of her maritime commerce. In her relations, friendly or hostile, with the great powers, she has directed all her military effort upon the fleet and in preparation for naval war."

Speaking against participation in the war at meeting in Monument National, Montreal, Dec. 16, 1916, Bourassa said:

"French civilization does not need England to save it, England whose armies devastated France time after time, and who carried more ruin and destroyed more churches than the Germans could do in ten years. They talk of little countries, the rights of little countries. Think of Russia and Britain who have seized everything, despoiled everything."

Before Union St. Joseph de Saint Heart in St. Henri College Hall, Montreal, May 30, 1916.

"Why should we aid France? When they cannot help us here? Suppose a civil war should break out, which, please God, cannot happen, and people of Quebec stood bayonet in hand against the people of Ontario, could France declare war on England and come over and render us assistance in our fight for Nationality?"

At Monument National, Montreal, Jan. 14, 1915, Mr. Bourassa said:

"Let England look after herself, as she is capable to. We in Canada are in the position of negro slaves in Virginia, who, at least, were well fed by their masters."

"No nation has the right to hold the dominion over the whole world, England any more than Germany. There has been a great deal of protest over Germany's treatment of Belgium. What about the treatment that the Boers in South Africa received from England? What of England's treatment of Nationalists of Ireland and of the French Canadian race? Every small nation has a right to live and it must not be pretended that the German yoke is heavier than the English."

Speaking Monument National, Montreal, June 7, 1917, he said:

"We will have to have courage to face demagogic passion. Neither Parliament nor the Government has the right to impose conscription, because Parliament is dying and the Government already is in a state of putrefaction. We will fight this iniquitous law brought on by a demented brain."

"In your name, in the name of your sons, we will rise and we will make it well understood that there is an end, there is a limit to our endurance, and that we will resist to the last by all legitimate and fair means this compulsory military service."

In Le Devoir, June 1, 1917, he wrote:

"Canada," he says, "has furnished all the man power she can for this war without grave danger to her own existence and that of the allies."

In article written for New York Evening Post and published July 7, 1917, he stated:

"Conscription is sure to bring serious troubles in the labor circles. Indiscriminate enlistment has already disorganized labor conditions. Rightly or wrongly, labor leaders apprehend that conscription is sought for not so much for military purposes as with the object of controlling wages and work. The enforcement of conscription will certainly be resisted by the organized labor of Canada."

From Le Devoir of recent dates, are the following:

"As far as things military are concerned, the time for conscription is over. What is important is not to send soldiers but to send no more. At Lachize the other day a speaker remarked. If you are logical you are against enlistment? That is right. All Canadians who wish to fight conscription must have courage to say that. We actually have four hundred and twenty thousand men in Europe and in training here. In proportion that would mean that France should have an army of two million four hundred thousand and the United Kingdom, 2,700,000. In spite of this calculation on paper, England has not yet sent over that number."

"One will admit, I suppose, that England has no less interest in keeping the Germans from Calais than Canada has. And here is another question. How many soldiers would France or England have to send to America if Canada was attacked by the United States?"