

Scotland is, their sole fatherland. They have enlisted for the European war as naturally as Canadians, either French or English, would take arms to defend Canada against an aggression on the American continent.

Thus it is rigorously correct to say that recruiting has gone in inverse ratio of the development of Canadian patriotism. If English-speaking Canadians have a right to blame the French-Canadians for the small number of recruits, the newcomers from the United Kingdom, who have supplied a much larger proportion of recruits than any other element of the population, would be equally justified in branding the Anglo-Canadians with disloyalty and treason. Enlistment for the European war is supposedly to be absolutely free and voluntary. This has been stated right and left from beginning to end. If that statement is honest and sincere, all provocations from one part of the population against the other, and exclusive attacks against the French-Canadians, should cease. Instead of reviling unjustly one-third of the Canadian people—a population so remarkably characterized by its constant loyalty to national institutions and its respect for public order—those men who claim a right to enlighten and lead public opinion should have enough good fair and intelligence to see facts as they are and respect the motives of those who persist in their determination to remain more Canadian than English and French.

In short, English-speaking Canadians enlist in much smaller number than the newcomers from England, because they are more Canadian; French-Canadians enlist less than English-Canadians because they are totally and exclusively Canadian. To claim that their abstention is due to the "baneful" influence of the Nationalists is pure nonsense. Should I give way to the suggestion of my gallant cousin, I would be just as powerless as Sir Wilfrid Laurier to induce the French-Canadians to enlist. This is implicitly acknowledged in Capt. Papineau's letter. On the one hand, he asserts that my views on the participation of Canada in the war are denied by my own friends; on the other he charges the mass of the French-Canadian population with a refusal to answer the call of duty. The simple truth is that the abstention of the French-Canadians is no more the result of the present attitude of the Nationalists than the consequence of the Liberal campaign of 1896, or of the Conservative appeals of 1911. It relates to deeper causes: hereditary instincts, social and economic conditions, a national tradition of three centuries. It is equally true, however, that those deep and far distant causes have been strengthened by the constant teaching of all our political and social leaders, from Lafontaine, Cartier, Macdonald, Mackenzie, to Laurier inclusively. The only virtue, or crime, of the Nationalists is to persist in believing and practising what they were taught by the men of the past and even those of today. This is precisely what infuriates the politicians, either blue or red. To please the Imperialists, they have renounced all their traditions and undertaken to bring the French-Canadians under imperial command. Unable to succeed, they try to conceal their fruitless apostasy by denouncing to the hatred of the jingo the obtrusive witnesses of their past profession of faith.

The jingo press and politicians have also undertaken to persuade their gullible followers that the Nationalists hinder the work of recruiters because of the persecution meted out to the French minorities in Ontario and Manitoba. This is but another nonsense. My excellent cousin, I am sorry to say—or his inspirers—has plucked it up.

The two questions are essentially distinct; this we have never ceased to assert. One is purely internal; the other affects the international status of Canada and her relations with Great Britain. To the problem of the teaching of languages we ask for a solution in conformity with the spirit of the federal agreement, the best interests of Confederation, and the principles of pedagogy as applied in civilized countries. Our attitude on the participation of Canada in the war is inspired exclusively by the constant tradition of the country and the agreements concluded half a century ago between Canada and Great Britain. Even if the irritating bilingual question was non-existent, our view on the war would be what it is. The most that can be said is, that the backward and essentially Prussian policy of the rulers of Ontario and Manitoba give us an additional argument against the intervention of Canada in the European conflict. To speak of fighting for the preservation of French civilization in Europe while endeavoring to destroy it in America, appears to us as an absurd piece of inconsistency. To preach Holy War for the liberties of the peoples overseas, and to oppress the national minorities in Canada, is in

our opinion, nothing but odious hypocrisy.

It is necessary to add that, in spite of his name, Captain Papineau is utterly unqualified to judge of the feelings of the French-Canadians. For most part American, he has inherited with a few drops of French blood, the most denationalized instincts of his French origin. From those he calls his compatriots he is separated by his religious belief and his maternal language. Of their traditions, he knows but what he has read in a few books. He was brought up far away from all contact with French-Canadians. His higher studies he pursued in England. His elements of French culture he acquired in France. The complexity of his origin and the diversity of his training would be sufficient to explain his mental hesitations and the contradictions which appear in his letter. Under the sway of his American origin, he glories in the Revolution of 1776; he calls it a war "for the principle of national existence." In good logic, he should approve highly of the tentative rebellions of the Sinn Feiners, and suggest that Canada should raise in arms to break the yoke of Great Britain. His American forefathers, whom he admires so much, fought against England and called upon France and Spain to help them against their mother country, for lighter motives than those of the Dublin rebels. The Imperial burden they refused to bear was infinitely less ponderous than that which weighs today upon the people of Canada.

Enemy Competition After the War

By W. E. DOWDING, London, Eng.

The appointment by the Prime Minister of a Committee to consider the commercial and industrial policy to be adopted in this country after the war, marks an important stage in what may very fairly be called the revolution in our national ideas on fiscal matters. The Committee is to specially consider the conclusions reached at the Economic Conference of the Allies. It is becoming evident that some of those conclusions are impracticable. For instance, they presume an imperial unity of policy with regard to tariffs, if not a Customs Union such as that adopted by the various States that made up the German Empire. A Union of that kind is considered impossible. The Committee indeed is asked to answer some very pertinent questions. They are asked to say:

(a) What industries are essential to the future safety of the nation; and what steps should be taken to maintain or establish them.

(b) What steps should be taken to recover home and foreign trade lost during the war, and to secure new markets.

(c) To what extent and by what means the resources of the Empire should and can be developed.

(d) To what extent and by what means the sources of supply within the Empire can be prevented from falling under foreign control.

I think it may be said that those four questions are stated in order of importance. They throw into prominence the opinion which is now almost unanimously held that our fiscal policy in the future must be brought into relation with our military policy.

A Representative Committee.

The Committee is a good one. It fairly represents the protectionist and the free-trader, the employer and the employee. It is rather a new thing to have labour leaders on committees of this kind. Their presence is explained by the fact that must always be borne in mind, viz., that the question of wages will enter more critically than ever before into the problems of commerce after the war. Some of our large exporting industries have hitherto been built up on labour that was not highly paid in contrast with labour in some countries that did not enjoy the advantages of free imports. If there is to be any restriction on imports in the future the question of wages is vitally touched, and the wage-earners through their organizations—which during the last two years of high earnings have built up large defence funds—will fight powerfully against any reduction.

The Chairman of the Committee, though a Unionist, has always been an ardent free-trader. The two fiscal experts on the Committee are: Mr. Hewins, the Secretary of the Tariff Commission, and Sir Alfred Mond, who is perhaps the most powerful debater in Parliament on fiscal subjects. He was

With the threat contained in the conclusion of his letter, I need not be concerned. Supposing always that he is truly responsible for that document, I make broad allowance for the excitement and perturbation resulting from his strenuous life. He and many of his comrades will have enough to do in order to help Canada to counteract the disastrous consequences of the war venture in which she has thrown herself headlong. To propagate systematically national discord by quarrelling with all Canadians, either French or English, who hold different views as to the theory and practice of their national duty, would be a misuse of time. Moreover it would be a singular denial of their professions of faith in favor of liberty and civilization.

As to the scoundrels and bloodsuckers "who have grown fat with the wealth dishonorably gained" in war contracts, I give them up quite willingly to their just indignation. But those worthies are not to be found in nationalist ranks; they are all recruited among the noisiest preachers of the Holy War waged for "civilization" against "barbarity," for the "protection of small nations," for the "honor" of England and the "salvation" of France.

Yours truly,

HENRI BOURASSA.

P. S.—I hope this will reach you before you leave for the front; no doubt you have been the first to respond to the pressing call of your partner.—H. B.

one of the leading spirits of the Free Trade Union which from 1903 down to the outbreak of the war defended free trade successfully through three general elections.

Enemy Competition, and Tariffs.

The signs of movement in political circles are not very well defined in these days when all our thoughts and energies are centred upon the destruction of militarism. But it is gradually becoming clear that the Unionist party, which may be taken for all practical purposes to be the tariff reform or protectionist party, is cleaving into two groups. They will probably resolve themselves into a high tariff section and a low tariff section. They will both be animated by an unconquerable desire to exclude enemy competition; but while the former section holds that this can be done by a high tariff, the latter is perhaps inclined to prohibit enemy competition altogether and to impose low tariff duties on neutrals and allies with, of course, preference to the Oversea Dominions.

There are prohibitionists on the free trade side also. They maintain that the continuance after the war of the prohibitive measures which are now in force will be no breach of free trade. They point out that even a high tariff is no complete guarantee against competition, whilst it would inevitably raise prices at home in a manner conflicting with free trade principles. Prohibition would be declared wholly against certain articles and partially against others, and the Government would control both the importation and the price of articles not wholly prohibited. There are other free-traders who consider a tariff against enemy imports more practicable than prohibition, and at the same time they dislike anything in the nature of direct government control of supplies. A third section of the free-trade party declares its adherence to the principles of Richard Cobden in their entirety, after the war. They point out that we built up inexhaustible resources under a free-trade system and that we can do so again after the war under the same system. They argue that the accumulation of capital in this way is the surest defence against aggression. They say also that it would be uneconomical to decline to trade with any country whatsoever after the declaration of peace.

Conflicting Views.

At the present time these conflicting views are under active discussion in political circles, though you will not find them very widely noticed by our press. One thing is clear. It will no longer be possible to say that the Liberal party is the free-trade party. The Liberal party is bound to come to a division on this question, and in my opinion popular feeling in the country will be entirely with that section which will express the disinclination of the populace to purchase any of the products of Germany.

(Continued on Page 24)

Most stu-
concerning
war, and t
The Kais
with flower
a private
dor. The
exception
Madrid po
British. O
Spain have
opportunity
nents of G
wildering
of a very

The opi
vastating
tics. They
iations wi
land durin
other feel
is, in fact,
lution her
and strike
the one h
ism on th

It is for
the break
national c
in either
things an
Liberals
re-organiz
separate
teries; an
rial advan
The Cons
solidate t
and stren
teries; an
among th
parties th
mise on t
most ext
general,
indicated
this most
to unite
national

The mo
British, i
very four
merce, in
know th
and the
group of
seek to
tion in p
of assem
On the o
group wi
spiration
perhaps,
of all Ch
ration of
look, the
dom from
expressio
and all
its pedan
living, a
Germany
nation;
a place
than all
savor of
of the C
would t
culture
trol of
Spain.