

trained troops, thoroughly organized and in the highest state of discipline and efficiency. The reader may judge for himself by the study I have given of the past, whether or no the Mother Country could count upon an effective defence, if we were engaged in a war abroad similar to that of 1900 and 1901, when her Militia (the very heart of our Home defence) would be called upon to supply the Army in the field, and when we bear in mind the history of the effective strength of our Regular Army and Militia, as given by me in the earlier portion of my writings. I maintain and repeat that this voluntary system in spite of the changes proposed by the Secretary of State for War, is totally inadequate to ensure our safety or to satisfy the desires of the citizens of our Empire. We can run no risks; we are able to make our safety certain; it is our duty to do so, and we should never rest till our full responsibility is realized and our Empire safe beyond question or doubt.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE OUR ONLY SAFEGUARD.

I have said that it rests with ourselves to make our defences sufficiently strong to meet any possible strain, and this method lies in the adoption of the principle that "It is the inherent duty of every citizen to defend his country."

Every able-bodied British citizen throughout the Empire, between the ages of 18 and, say, 21, should be made to undergo a period of military (or naval) training, and earn certificates of efficiency in drill and shooting. Only such as are in possession of such certificates should be entitled to enter the Regular or Active Army; all others to pass into the Militia Reserve, which Militia Reserve could be divided into three categories: the First or Active Reserve, the Second or War Reserve, and the Third or Home Reserve.

Comparing our population with that of France, this would give the United Kingdom an army when on a war footing, of over 3,000,000 men. It would allow the recruit to undergo his full training before entering the Regular Army; it would ensure the Regular Army receiving into its ranks highly efficient men, and it would give an opportunity to all classes to enter the military service as a profession; a de-

sire that burns strongly in the bosoms of our countrymen to-day as it did in the bosoms of our forefathers.

The same system would and should be adopted throughout the Empire (indeed, it has already been partially introduced into New Zealand and Australia) in a more or less modified form as may be best suited to the particular circumstances existing in each country.

The arguments commonly used against universal military service are based on false assertions and improper pleas. The cases are different as regards home defence and foreign service, and it is allowed that foreign service must be kept up by voluntary enlistment into the Regular Active Army. The Militia Billot Act shows that universal personal service is agreeable to the Constitutional Law of England. The State has the right to demand the services of every able-bodied citizen in defence of the country. Mills says in his "Essay on Liberty" that society is justified in enforcing, at all costs, that each person bear his share of the labors and sacrifices incurred in defending society. When Hampden refused to pay ship money, it was admitted that "defence against invasion lay as a burden upon all." In the time of Charles I the law recognized "the obligation of every citizen to bear arms." By the Statutes of Winchester, 1285, "every freeman between 15 and 60 was obliged to be provided with armor to preserve the peace." In Henry VII time the duty of every subject was "to serve and assist his sovereign at all seasons where need shall require." As late as 1806, the principle of the *Levy-en-Masse* Bill rested "on the undoubted prerogative of the Crown to call upon the services of all liege subjects." In 1807 Lord Sidmouth asserted without contradiction "the right of the State to demand military service of all or every member of the community for the purpose of domestic defence." The law of England is clear on this point, that universal military service can be enforced for the defence of the country.

Let us next deal with the arguments used against compulsory military service. It is urged that it is an infringement of the liberty of the subject. But the foundation of our liberty is resistance to an invader; our personal and social freedom depends upon the liberty which goes with the defence of our country. Another one-