

WHAT BOURASSA TELLS QUEBEC

At the outset, Mr. Bourassa says that now that the country is in danger of revolution he wishes to join hands with his friends and enemies in order to save the country. He calls upon all friends of Canada, without going back on their respective and legitimate convictions and without binding themselves by any engagement for the future, to unite in a loyal effort to save Canada, because it is more in peril than many people believe, and he adds that it is not on the battle fields of Europe that its fate is being decided.

To the anti-conscriptionists he issues a warning against riot. He advises them to sign petitions, but to remain quiet in their homes, because in his opinion that method is infinitely more effective than street demonstrations. He advises French-Canadians to remember that at the present time, as always, they are the defenders of order and the Constitution, and sooner than they think, perhaps, it will be proven that in opposing the designs of the partisans of this war they are the most faithful subjects of the king. It is better not to spoil this noble role by childish and dangerous fist-fights.

If the recruiting of troops was the only or the principal consideration of the moment, the Government would have been justified in voting conscription. The day that we went below the normal figure of voluntary enlistment, obligatory service would have been made necessary. On several occasions he says that he has expressed the opinion that conscription would have been better than the pernicious system of enlistment falsely called voluntary, and he has not changed his opinion. He goes further and says, that if the Government and Parliament had been sincere when they proclaimed their determination to consecrate all the resources of the country, in men and money, for the welfare of the Empire, of France, and of superior civilization and democracy, they ought to have adopted the selective conscription law at the very beginning, as the United States have done. That was the only rational method of assuring the maximum effort of the country in both a military and economic sense in the recruiting of a large army without disorganizing agriculture and essential industries. But whether it was due to a lack of real understanding of the situation, or to a lack of courage to face it, the Government organized its army by methods which allowed everything else to be disorganized. Each day, each week, each month the fault has been aggravated.

To the partisans of conscription who say that the measure proposed by the Government, though it may be late, is nevertheless a remedy, Mr. Bourassa replied: "No, it's too late; the remedy to-day would be worse than the ailment."

Before submitting in detail his arguments why conscription would be a bad remedy, Mr. Bourassa says that all he wants is that his arguments shall be studied for their intrinsic value. He thinks these arguments can be accepted by all men of good will—Liberals or Conservatives, Nationalists or Imperialists, partisans or adversaries of Canada's intervention in the war. Because while some want above all the welfare of the Empire and others the triumph of the Allies, and while to his thinking the welfare of Canada remains the principal objective, they are all agreed upon one essential point—the necessity of saving the national unity of Canada, and of preserving its economic foundations. "For us," he says, "that is the principal object, if not the only object. For the Imperialists, or the partisans of intervention, it is the most sure means of attaining the end." He admits that it would be useless to try and find a basis for an understanding with those who persist in wanting to ruin Canada to save the Mother Country.

In the strict military sense, the time for conscription is passed. What is urgent is not to send more soldiers, but to send no more at all. Partisans against conscription have been told that to be logical they must be opposed to any future enrolment. That is the exact truth, and all Canadians who want to fight conscription logically should have the courage to say and to repeat everywhere: "No Conscription; No Enrolment; Canada has done enough."

Comparing the military effort of Canada with that

A TRANSLATION in summary form of the articles recently published in *Le Devoir*, the Nationalist organ of Quebec, is given on this page in order that readers of this paper all over Canada may know what these teachings are. In reading the summary we are conscious that a certain Bourassa accent and manner of expression is omitted because incapable of being conveyed in translation. Only the arguments are presented as an extreme example of what a section of Quebec is being asked to think on the subject of Canada's part in the war. We believe the summary and the translation to be a fair transcription of those teachings, and that it is one of the functions of the Canadian Courier to set them forth; not because they are representative of what Quebec really thinks on this question, but of what a section of Quebec is likely to think if these teachings are given enough circulation, coupled with endorsement. The views expressed have nothing to do with anything the Canadian Courier has said or may yet say on this matter. They are not an advertisement of Mr. Bourassa, but a summary of what he says, and they are printed as a matter of news for the information of our readers.—The Editor.

of the other nations, Mr. Bourassa points out that Canada now actually has in Europe or in training camps, in England, 420,000 men. If the population of Canada was estimated at the beginning of the war at 7,000,000—though as many foreigners left the country in 1914, this is the highest figure—we have then enrolled six per cent. of our population for the European War. This is equal to an army of 2,400,000 for France, and 2,700,000 for the United Kingdom. But in spite of all the figures on paper which have been issued, England has not sent to France this number of men, even after two years and ten months of war. And it will be admitted that England has an interest at least equal to that of Canada in preventing the German army from reaching Calais. Mr. Bourassa asks this question: "How many soldiers of France, and even of England, would we see in America if Canada was attacked by the United States?"

Canada's army costs Canada three times more per head per soldier than England's and four times more than the French army. If we multiply the comparative figure attributed to France by four and that of England by three, the conclusion is that the present army of Canada has cost Canada what it would cost England to have an army of 8,100,000 men, and France an army of 9,600,000 men. And while England and France, after the United States to-day, are the two richest nations of the world, Canada is the poorest.

A comparison with the United States is even more striking. The situation of the two countries is identical. The far off danger of German aggression is the same for the two countries. The American nation is fourteen times more populated and 74 times richer than Canada. To equal the effort made by Canada up to the present time the United States would have to send to Europe an army of 6,000,000 men and meet an expenditure of at least \$100,000,000,000. Yet the most extravagant of the American jingoes have spoken only of a possible army of 3,000,000 after two years of preparation. That would be only the exact half of what Canada has done up to now. But the Americans who represent more accurately the official opinion estimate that 1,000,000 American soldiers will take part in the war in Europe. In that case, the military effort of Canada would be six times higher than that of the United States, and it will have lasted three years longer. Calculated in dollars and cents the disparity is even greater. The United States pays \$1 per day to its soldiers; Canada pays \$1.10. In taking for a basis the present army of 420,000 men for Canada and a possible army of 2,000,000 men for the United States (though half that figure is generally accepted and calculated as the most extreme) each Canadian ratepayer, man, woman, and child pays \$24 per annum for the army, while the American will only pay \$7. If the war finished next year, the Canadian will have paid, or will have to pay \$96 to the American's \$7; if the war goes on until 1919, the Canadian will have to pay \$120 per head, while the American will be let off with \$14. This calculation is made on the basis of simple privates, and when officers, pensions, transports, arms, etc., are included, the difference is even more considerable. It can be affirmed without the least hesitation that the military effort of the United States, to whatever degree of intensity it goes, is going to cost six times less dear to each American than the effort of Canada

to each Canadian, even supposing that Canada does not enlist a soldier other than those we have at present under arms. How then, indeed, Mr. Bourassa asks, can there be found a single Canadian who will not declare: "We have done our share, and more than our share."

IN the economic sense, as well as in the military sense, it is necessary to call Halt! We have done enough for the war; indeed, we have done too much. What is necessary now is not to develop the war budget and spend more for destruction, but to stop the race towards bankruptcy, and utilize all the resources of the country in order to develop agricultural production without delay and make possible the reconstruction of to-morrow.

The motto, "Ruin Canada to save the Mother Country" is not only national treason; it is also treason to the cause of the Allies, and if the Government and Parliament of Canada persist

in the execution of their monstrous design of conscription they will deal a most disastrous blow to England and the whole British Empire. Almost at the beginning of the war, Lloyd George warned England that the victory would depend upon the last piece of gold and the last blade of wheat. Almost a year ago, Sir George Paish, perhaps the most competent economist of the British Empire, whom the Imperial Government has chosen to establish the base of the financial relations between Great Britain and the United States, warned the Dominions against the danger of an excess of zeal. In the interests of England and the Empire, he counselled them not to pass the measure of their force; not to accumulate a debt out of proportion to their capacity to pay, and not to overburden their annual budget with overwhelming interest charges that would paralyze their activities.

Actuated by their respective sympathies and their antipathies for different countries in Europe, the Canadian people have too much forgotten the essential character and the motive which was at the bottom of this war. Mr. Bourassa claims that the infamous God of Gold is to blame, and he contends that race hatred, the thirst for conquest, and even the legitimate demands of peoples, are only instruments which serve preying men of international high finance to precipitate nations one against the other. But he says that to Canadians now is not the time to settle which were the nations the most or the least guilty for this war. This is the time for Canada to find out what it ought to do if it wants to avoid being crushed and annihilated. Canada owes it to herself, as well as to the Empire, of which it forms a part, and to the Allies in this war, not to die of inanition after the war, and not to allow herself to be bled white.

Any additional military effort, any piling on of the war budget would mean ruin and suicide to Canada. We have reached, if indeed, we have not passed, the extreme limit of our capacity to pay for destruction. The Finance Minister testifies that Canada has spent not less than \$600,000,000 for the war up to the 31st March last. The estimated expenditure for the current year is \$500,000,000, making altogether \$1,100,000,000. That does not include pensions, nor interest charges on the war debt. If it is estimated that the national wealth of the United States is 74 times higher than that of Canada—and that is the proportion established by the best informed economists—then our expenditure is equivalent to a war expenditure of more than \$80,000,000,000 for the American nation. Even the most exalted fanatics of democracy have not dreamt of suggesting that the American nation should squander half or a quarter of that sum in the abyss of this war.

IF our governors, our public men, our captains of industry and finance, wanted to go to the trouble of making a complete inventory of the situation and would reflect five minutes of the morrow that we must prepare for, they would be the first to cry: "Not another man; not another dollar." It is well understood that we must maintain the effort accomplished, and see to the obligations incurred. But

(Concluded on page 18.)