

Cost and Profit of Liberty.—No. III.

EVERYTHING that is worth having costs, and there is nothing national better worth having than national liberty. We must have it, and we can secure it, while retaining our connection with Britain, only by sharing in the cost. This can be done through representation in the Imperial Parliament or by gradually forming a well-understood alliance, offensive and defensive, with her. The latter method has so many advantages over the former that it is the one to be taken. In order to it, the first condition on our part is an effective militia force, adequate to our own defence and available—if need should arise—for Imperial defence. What then is needed to make our militia effective.

First, regular drill. The militia in England are drilled twenty-eight days every year, and every regiment has attached to it a paid adjutant with a corps of eight to ten paid instructors, who give their whole time to the work. Our militia are drilled for only twelve days, and they have neither paid adjutants nor instructors. Worse, the battalions are now called out for drill only every second, sometimes every third, year. In those circumstances how can the men keep in touch with each other, or the officers keep in touch with the men? It is impossible in the country, where there are no drill sheds or armouries, yet the rural battalions would have to bear the brunt of any trouble which might arise. The city regiments could not be called out for active service, without disarranging industry and commerce disastrously; and besides, men accustomed to the comforts of city life could not be expected, however brave, to endure the rough and tumble of severe campaigning, like mechanics and hardy country lads. The first charge on our militia vote then should be for twelve, or, if possible, sixteen or twenty days drill every year, by the whole force. We have only 35,000 enrolled; while the Australasian Colonies, with a population of less than four millions, have between 40,000 and 50,000 in a condition too of administrative and executive efficiency decidedly superior to ours, to judge from what I saw of various encampments. Not only so, the Australian Colonies have spent large sums on coast defences, Melbourne in particular being the best defended commercial city in the Empire. They have also a larger permanent force than Canada, trained, too, to work their big guns, mines and torpedo defences, all of which they have of the best kinds. Canada should have a militia of 50,000; but better to have 25,000 drilled for at least twelve days every year, than a nominal 35,000. The weather-cock action of the Government last summer, with regard to the drill of the city battalions, was unpardonable. Such a case of "I will" and "I won't" was surely never seen before in Canada. Even when "I will" at last prevailed, the drill was pared down to eight days! The men put in twelve days or more, but so far, pay for only eight days has been received. Considering the sacrifices made by both officers and men, such treatment is scandalous. Better disband the force than risk a repetition of such forcible-feeble administration.

Secondly, a supply of officers thoroughly educated in military science and art. Canadians have the military instinct and can be turned into good soldiers in three months; but it takes years to make good officers. The United States learned this, especially in their last great war. "General" Ben Butler and scores of civilians thought themselves Napoleons at the outset; but before long it was found that the men who had been trained at West Point were the only possible material for generals. Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and the Johnstones on the southern side; McLellan, Grant, Sherman, Thomas on the northern were the men who showed that they knew their business. But, it may be asked, have we not a Royal Military College maintained by the Dominion, and does not it exist to train officers for the public service? We have a military college, but it is scientifically constructed on the principle of "How not to do it." Men who enter West Point, Woolwich or Sandhurst are selected from the whole nation and for their military tastes and aptitudes; they have a stiff entrance examination in non-professional subjects; and as they are intended for public work their training costs them nothing, and when they graduate the country avails itself of their services. In Canada, on the contrary, only the sons of the rich can become cadets. When first established, the cost to a cadet was fixed at \$650 for the

four years course, about the sum that would suffice if he attended a university for the same length of time. It is now fixed at \$1,450, or, including necessary extras, fully \$1,600. In other words, instead of getting the likeliest men from all ranks of society, we limit ourselves to a small class of the community. The attendance, which was once 92, has fallen to 57. But the crowning absurdity is that the Government, after spending somewhere about \$4,000 on the education of each cadet, says to him on his graduation, "We have no use for you." The British Government gives appointments to four of the graduates annually, though for every appointment at its disposal there are a dozen eager competitors; but the Canadian Government can find nothing for the others to do! Men who take the position that Canada should not have a Military College are consistent—though far from agreeing with them—it seems to me that we should have a Naval Academy also. But it is impossible to understand the position of those who favour it, yet interpose insurmountable obstacles to getting the best men, and then make a present to other countries of the graduates. "Purchase," abolished in the British army, finds its last refuge in Canada! The purchasers, too, are sold, as well as the country; for the Government takes their money, spends two or three times as much more on them, and then turns them adrift!

Yet the great requisite for an effective militia is a steady supply of educated officers. Why then not utilize the R. M. C. graduates? Attach them for a year to the permanent schools, send them for six months to Aldershot, and then give them commissions in the permanent force, make them adjutants of the militia regiments, and—if there are any left—give them junior positions in the Public Works Department, where good engineers are evidently required. If all are not absorbed in these ways, offer to the Provincial Governments the privilege of nominating cadets to the college, as is done in the States, on condition that each Province shall appoint a graduate annually to its Public Works Department.

It may be said that these two requisites to an effective militia would cost money. Doubtless. And so would good rifles and Maxims. But what is the use of playing at soldiers? All shams are bad, but sham in military matters is very particularly detestable. An addition of half a million to the present militia vote would cover the cost, and the money would be well spent; needless to say, much better spent than in building political railways or in digging a useless canal, on the impudently avowed plea that a county should get its share of public plunder. G. M. GRANT.

The Socialism of To-day.—II.*

BY HAMPDEN BURNHAM, M.A.

SOCIALISM is a theory of social or state control of industrial and commercial systems and interests. There was a time when it meant, as the name implies, merely a desire of the people to unite for the purpose of improving their industrial condition.

Society organized for public or general purposes of government is called a state. Unless all agree to the formation of this organization there arises at the outset the question of the right of men to form a state, affecting as it of necessity does the conditions of all. This question is a fundamental one, and involves the statement of the right upon which a dissenting individual bases his claim to an independent status. If the individual be possessed of merely the right of physical force, then the statement of his right need proceed no farther as the existence of the state is its own justification. If, on the other hand, the individual claims a moral right to an independent status, it is necessary to go to the root of the matter and to ascertain what "the individual" is, what his claim means, and if his claim be valid; unless, indeed, the formation of the state be merely for the purpose of *protecting* the rights of the individual, when, manifestly, any objection on his part is at once reduced to an absurdity. If, however, the formation of the State involves not only protection but what modern State-socialism seeks, State-interference or initiative, by which it is meant that society organized shall have compulsory control of the individual in some degree, then the inquiry must proceed. State-control directly traverses this alleged moral right of the individual, and also, it

* To be continued.