

038549

September 16th.

Memo for Sir Robert Borden from O'Connor

Letters received with enclosures and briefs being prepared.

But O'Connor does not think that you should dignify Currie or the Montreal Star by any reference to the matter. Old stuff. Produced no reaction. Object is to put Currie to the front in case can put Meighen to the rear. A dud. O'C thinks, too, that Currie's remarks have been touched up by the press. The forces in France were recruited from the forces in England. The forces in England were only for a short time in excess of 100,000 even taking in men in hospitals &c. Currie's remarks are qualified by "apparently" as to rejection of medical advice, and he refers to some of the 100,000 as being in hospitals yet. The rejection of medical advice charge, if made, applies only to some of the 100,000 that was of no use, if that remark made. Star editorial shows this clearly understood. No charge of neglect or inefficiency on part of the government that I can see as to the whole 100,000. In what connection men of no use not disclosed. Evidences of looseness of expression on Currie's part or misreporting by press. Currie merely illustrating advisability of governments being guided by expert advice. If he is not misreported then he was fouling his nest and attacking his own army, which was drawn from England where the alleged ineffectives were the only source upon which he could draw. Will collect actual figures and work this out. If the men who went from England to France were "no good" as to a large extent they must have been, assuming Currie to have made the statement, let us thank God for our no good forces. Reminds one of Lincoln's reply to the complainers that Grant drank too much whiskey. "Where does he get it/^{so} that I can get some and send it to my other generals." Those Canadian no goods must have been pretty good after all, because the force in France, necessarily recruited from the no goods in England, became progressively a better force to the end. Think Currie should be asked by personal letter just what he did say. If, then, it transpires that he did say what is reported, and you issue a statement I would in your place state the actual facts, without proofs, as facts, not by way of defence, and would attack Currie as having directly impeached the capacity of the victorious Canadian Army. The Star's editorial places the Star proprietor beyond the pale. He was consulted, agreed, advised, took part in and at the time supported. A dangerous political traitor.

MEIGHEN PAPERS, Series 3 (M.G. 26, I, Volume 69)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA