

An ill informed correspondent of the *Petit Journal*, of Paris, tells its readers that the descendants of the early French colonists "are now in movement to re-conquer Canada," "without war, revolution or violent struggle, by the power alone of the inherent expansion belonging to this prodigiously fecund race." For whom the French Canadians wish to "re-conquer" their own country does not precisely appear—certainly it is not for France, whose methods of government have no attraction for the French speaking Britons who form so large and important a part of the population of the Dominion. The French Canadians jealously resent any interference with their peculiar rights of language and laws under the treaty of cession, and like their English, Irish and Scotch fellow citizens, cherish the memories of their forefathers, but Queen Victoria has no more loyal subjects than those acquired through the cession of Canada by France to England.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

[This paper does not necessarily share the views expressed in correspondence published in its columns, the use of which is freely granted to writers on topics of interest to the Militia.]

THE STATIONS OF THE BATTERIES.

EDITOR MILITIA GAZETTE.—Rumours are again afloat that "A" and "B" Batteries are to exchange stations in the near future. I have asked many people the reason for these exchanges and the only reasons that I can elicit are, that it is an Imperial custom; that it is a bad thing for a corps to take root in a place and form ties there.

In the Imperial army *foreign service* is the peculiar characteristic, and troops are frequently moved from one station to another, and this moving is closely connected with long service, without reference as to whether they are best suited to our circumstances or not.

If it be true that it is a bad thing to let the troops sympathize with the civil population around them, and must therefore have a "moving army," then let us, at once, enlist men for long service with a good pension to look forward to at the end of it.

When it is remembered that the usual time heretofore spent on a station has been *five* years, and the term of enlistment *three* years only, I fail to see the necessity of moving.

If these periodical changes are necessary for the artillery, why not also for the cavalry and infantry?

If all the permanent corps are moved (and if two, why not all (it will entail an expenditure of, at least, twenty thousand dollars by the Government, and in addition considerable loss and expense to married officers and men. This sum could be much more profitably employed for other militia purposes, notably teaching the men how to shoot.

On both occasions when "A" and "B" Batteries exchanged stations, many men whose time had expired, or nearly so, obtained their discharge by purchase or otherwise, and after the new battery had settled down, enlisted again, thus defeating the presumed object for which the exchange was made. Many others who could not obtain their discharges at the time, refused to re-engage at the expiration of their term, and were in accordance with regulations, furnished with transport to their homes at public expense.

"If a corps lived permanently in one city or town, the men would become neighbours of the people and the corps a local institution. In a short time it would be found that soldiering meant passing a few years in a school of order and discipline in the midst of the soldier's friends and little

dread of it would remain. A permanent home for the corps would also stop in a measure, desertion, making it a more difficult and dangerous undertaking." Such is the opinion of a very able British officer on the subject.

Officers may be said to be permanent and they might be changed occasionally with benefit to the service, enabling them to obtain a local knowledge of a larger extent of country, very useful to the officer, especially if he should be some day called to command, but of little value to the private.

AUDACE.

CONTINUOUS PROMOTIONS.

EDITOR MILITIA GAZETTE, "It is uncertain, when a general has taken the field, how long his services may be required therein." The reply which the Duke of Wellington gave, upon one occasion, to an enquiry from the great Napoleon as to how long he (the Duke) contemplated the, then, coming campaign to continue, is quite true, applicable and germane in more instances than on that special occasion.

Despite the length of my former communication and quite explicitness of the points taken up therein I find, by your correspondents "N. C. O." and my friend "Sergeant," that some of the readers thereof require a little more explanation (which I am always happy and ready to give) to further facilitate their comprehension on one point therein mentioned, viz: the compulsory or establishment of appointments of commissioned officers from the ranks of the non-commissioned officers and privates respectively—a continuous promotion from private to commander-in-chief—as by me suggested in my first letter, as a remedy for the first and great evil now existing in our militia force.

I will now take up "N. C. O." and "Sergeant's" questions, in your issue of the 5th instant, in their order and thereto reply where practicable and severally where necessary.

1st. N. C. O. asks "are those to be appointed to have no say in the matter?" Now if "N. C. O." is a British subject (possibly better a Briton) who feels proud of the constitution under which he lives, which I hope he is and does, but would feel sorry should he not know of the fountain from whence came that pride and glory, *i. e.* servility is unknown to Britons—"Britons never, never shall be slaves," and British law, both municipal and military, contains a maxim that "no individual shall be compelled to accept of any gift, present or offering against his will."

Now the non-com. who is offered a commission may not accept the offer if he does not see fit, or his way clear to do so; but let the offer pass by to the next in rank and so on till one is found who is willing to accept, can and will qualify and make himself competent, to the best of his ability and the country's offer by the various military schools, for the office to which he is appointed, aspires and accepts. Understand me properly, the compulsory I mean is not to accept, but to give; not to destroy, but to improve and fulfil the present law so that promotion would become a non-com.'s right and when wrongfully withheld and given, as is too frequently practised now-a-days under the present rules, to some political or social favourite picked up from the street or club-house, and who soon thereafter leaves not only the limits but the country as I stated in my first letter, he could by the afore-mentioned maxim's sister maxim "there is no wrong without a remedy" enforce the same as by me pointed out in one of my first letters, a right of which under the present system he is unjustly deprived.

2nd. "Sergeant" and "N. C. O." both are (the former deeply, the latter perhaps not so much since reading my second letter) under the impression that the non-coms. would or could not, and finally be compelled to refuse the offer of a commission in the service for lack of cash.