

this war Myhrberg performed extraordinary feats of valor as a cavalry officer. He maintained himself and men for six months in 1827, in Chios, against a host of Turks, and, at last outnumbered, brought away safely the major part of the force under him. At Koldohri he had a leg broken by the bursting of a shell. Recovered, and in danger of capture, he swam with his arms to friendly ships off the coast. Gordon, the historian of the war, says of him, "He was the best and bravest of the Philhellenists." Greece free, he rested in France till the Polish war of 1830 called him to the side of the insurgents. He penetrated Austria and swam the river Wiesel under the fire of Austrian sentinels. As "Gen Langermann" he commanded a brigade in Rubinski's division of the Polish army, and took part in all desperate and hazardous enterprise of the war. Mieroslawski lauds enthusiastically the behaviour of Langermann's brigade in the fatal battle of Ostrolenka. Myhrberg had two horses killed under him, and his sabre shattered by a musket shot. When in the hottest part of the fight, the odds had left him with only a handful of men, reinforcements came, and their leader asked Myhrberg where his soldiers were. "There," he answered, pointing with the hilt of his broken sword to the heaps of the dead and the living handful. Myhrberg was captured by the Russians and sent to Siberia, but he escaped on the journey—thanks, it is said, to the wilful neglect of a Russian General, who had obligations to the Swede's family. Once more he entered the field; this time in the country where he won his spurs. Spain was convulsed by the struggles of the Christinists and the Carlists, and here Myhrberg fought for the last time. He returned to Sweden in 1840. His country has honored him with a great funeral, and to us he seems worthy of these few lines of biography.—[Fall Mall Gazette.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Volunteer Review.

SIR,—Now that the question of Confederation is settled, and the whole matter of the Volunteer force as a branch of the subject of defence will shortly come under the notice of the Confederate Legislature, it appears to be a fitting time to draw attention to the question of the payment of Volunteers.

During the last two years, and especially since the establishment of the Thorold Camp, the attendance of Volunteers at drill has fallen off, and great difficulty is found in procuring any parades whatever. This is due in a great measure, but not altogether, to the men having attended the camp, and they, having thus earned all the money they could earn, have no inducement to attend drill at home. But this is not the sole cause for the falling off. It arises also, and that to a greater degree than most persons imagine, from the present system of payment for drill, both as regards the amount paid and the mode of payment. Nor does this explanation of the difficulty put the matter on too mercenary a ground, or involve any imputation against the zeal or patriotism of the Volunteer force. If the Government, by paying the men for a limited time, give currency to the notion that the men have learned all that is required of them, it is not to be wondered at that the men themselves should become infected by the delusion that they have perfected themselves in drill, and hence become remiss in attendance. In order to see to what extent the present mode of payment contributes to this result let us consider what it is. An allowance of \$8 is paid each Volunteer for each

year. For this the Volunteer is required to drill sixteen days in each year. If he drills a less number of days than this he gets nothing; if a greater number, he gets no more. This drill is generally put in in thirty-two drills of one and a-half hours each; and, as it is difficult to get the men to attend more than once in each week, it will be seen that it requires thirty-two weeks drill in each year to earn this money. This mode of payment is open to several serious objections, having regard to what is desirable to be done, and to what in fact can be done, to ensure the necessary efficiency. It is desirable, if possible, that the men should drill once in each week of the year, as well for the purpose of properly instructing them, as also for the purpose of keeping their hands in. An interval of only a few weeks in drill tells sadly on the efficiency of the men as any Volunteer officer can testify. Moreover, with a less amount of drill the men cannot be properly instructed. But it is a matter of universal experience that when the men have completed their thirty-two weekly drills it is difficult to procure their further attendance that year. They have earned all they can earn, and have no inducement to attend any further. The mode of payment ought, therefore, to be so adjusted as to enable the Volunteer to get an equivalent in pay for every days drill it is deemed necessary he should attend. Further, the present plan, by requiring each man to earn the full amount of \$8, or get nothing at all, is unjust to those men who join, or feel disposed to join, a company at a period of the year too late to enable them to perform their thirty-two days drill before inspection. Take the case of a man joining, or desiring to join, twenty-four weeks before inspection. He will know, if he is correctly informed by his commanding officer, (and it is a matter of the last importance that his rights, or rather want of rights, in this respect should be fully explained to him) that he will receive no pay whatever for any drills he may perform that year. As a general rule, such a man, if he has joined, will not attend drill at all, or not as regularly as if he were to get paid for what he did. If he has not joined, in many cases he will refrain from doing so, and thus the force loses the services of a valuable recruit.

Again, there is another class of cases where men who are members of the force, either know, or have reason to believe, they will be compelled by business engagements or otherwise, to leave their company before they will be able to complete the thirty-two drills or before inspection, and who may still be desirous of drilling as long as they remain. Such cases are quite numerous through the country, and men in such a position generally abstain from drill, as they know they will get no pay for the same. The uses combined lead to the scanty attendance at drill so generally complained of, and to the want of proficiency and steadiness under arms, which is observed; and, until they are removed no amount of zeal on the part of officers or appeals to the public spirit of the men will remove the evil. It can be removed only by increasing the pay and by distributing it on a different principle. The pay should be increased so as to give the men pay for each drill they attend, without regard to the number of drills, of course within a certain fixed limit. This limit, we have seen, I should fix at one for each week, or fifty-two in the year at such periods as may be convenient. The amount paid, moreover, is not sufficient for the labor bestowed. I would, therefore, pay the Volunteer thirty cents for each of these drills that he actually attends, and that without regard to the question whether or no he is a member of the company at the time of inspection; provided that no man who is a member at the time of inspection should get paid unless he is present at inspection. For it is manifest that at an inspection of a company fifty-five strong, and where fifty-five are actually present under arms, under this plan there might still be others who had served that year, but also

might have left the company, who would be entitled to be paid. The presence of those men might, I conceive, be dispensed with. This plan would remove all the cause of complaint above mentioned. It would give every man who chooses to attend all the drills the sum of \$15.60 a year instead of \$8, and each man would receive payment for all the drills he attends, no matter when he joins or when he leaves, and thus the plan would be an incentive to recruiting and regular attendance. I am convinced that in this mode an attendance of from 40 to 45 men could be secured at each drill. If this be so, let us now see what objections can be urged against it. The only objection that occurs to me is that of the increased expense. Assuming that each man attends each of the drills it would produce an increase of \$7.60 for every man in the Volunteer force. I see that the number of Volunteer Battalions is 57, giving a force of (in round numbers) 20,000 men; and, I think, we may safely say that the force to be maintained in time of peace in these two Provinces will not much exceed this number. The pay of these under the present system is \$240,000, and under the system proposed, if a full attendance were given, would be \$468,000, or an increase of \$228,000 a year. But we cannot assume there would be a full attendance. Putting the average attendance of the Volunteers at 42 weeks in the year, the yearly pay would be \$12.60 a man, or \$378,000 for the entire force, and an increase of only \$138,000 a year over the present expenditure. If this Province is unable to bear this increased expenditure in order to make that efficient which is now inefficient, it may as well save itself the present expenditure which it now uselessly incurs. If, however, the rate of payment per day is considered too high, let it be placed at twenty-five cents per drill, which will produce an increase of only \$75,000 a year. Under this plan I would suggest a more stringent manner of vouching the pay-sheets than at present in use. There can be no doubt whatever that a large number of men get paid for drills they do not attend, that is, men are certified as having attended the requisite number of drills who, in fact, have attended only a portion of them; and this is done with no evil intent, but is merely the offspring of the present system. A man has joined a company at a period when he is only able to put in, say twelve days drill, before inspection, and he is one of those who is willing to run his chance of being paid. His commanding-officer has either to place the man's name in the pay-sheet, and he gets \$8, or to leave it off, and he gets nothing. If the officer does the latter he runs the chance of losing the man; if the former, the other men grumble that a man who has not drilled the prescribed period gets as much as those who have drilled the full number of days. Some officers, in their zeal for the service, think it no great harm to retain the Volunteer at the expense of a false certificate. This will continue to be done as long as the present system prevails, and any measures to prevent the practice will be powerless to reach the evil. Under the proposed plan all excuses for the irregularity will disappear, and to prevent it, some steps should be taken. A convenient plan would be to require as well the men as the officer to swear to a return each month of the actual attendance in the last preceding month, each man as to his own attendance, and the commanding officer as to the attendance of all. A penalty might be imposed both on man and officer for the offence of wilful false swearing. Throughout this letter I have assumed that the regular yearly drill will be as heretofore at the Company headquarters, and not in camp as last year, as I have regarded that as an exceptional year, arising out of the peculiar circumstances of the Province. I propose in a subsequent letter to give my reasons in favor of the former mode; or, at all events, for making the instructions in camps supplementary only to drill at home.

Yours, &c., A VOLUNTEER CAPTAIN.
Woodstock, May 6th, 1867.