

usefully the cause that Canada has espoused, and dispute dearly their lives to the enemy.

Sir Robert Borden, I am happy to say, has expressed a similar view in his speech before the Toronto Canadian Club, on the 5th of December. (\*)

### The duty of "French Canada"

With regard to the decision of parliament to bring Canada into this war, I have little to say at present, except this, that the question should never have been placed on the ground of races.

To make a direct and special appeal to the French Canadians, because French and English are fighting side by side in Europe, is to pave the way to most dangerous possibilities. If the French Canadians are led to believe that they have a special duty to perform, because of the casual co-operation of their two "motherlands", — as England and France are now called in the Province of Quebec — where will they be the day England is again the enemy of France, as she has been during seven centuries, as she was yet in the days of Fashoda?

If this unfortunate appeal to racial feelings is persisted in, let it be done at least with something akin to truth and justice.

All sorts of nasty comments have been passed upon the small proportion of French Canadians enlisted at Val Cartier. If this and all future Canadian contingents are to be classified by races and nationalities, a distinction should be established not only between French and English-speaking volunteers, but also between Canadian-born and British-born. If all British-born soldiers were counted out from the first contingent, it would be found that French-speaking Canadians enlisted in larger proportion than English-speaking Canadians. Out of less than 6,000 Canadian-born recruits, over 2,400

(\*) Also at Amherst, N. S., on the 17th of December, where the Prime Minister is reported in the Montreal "Gazette" as having stated that "it would be detrimental to the success of British arms to send men to the battle lines unless properly trained".