

our past show that we have always obtained such extensions of liberty as we asked for, and also that we asked for them only after asserting constitutionally that we were prepared for them and that they would suit ourselves? Is not Mr. Longley witness that at present the "Greater Britain" party predominates in the Mother Country as it never did before, while manifestly a Colonial Secretary is at the helm whose highest ambition is to make us sharers in the responsibilities and the prizes, that is, in the heritage of the greatest empire the world has ever known?

In a word, it seems to me scarcely fair to put the blame of our not having full citizenship on Great Britain, when we ourselves have never asked for it, as we did ask at different times for representative institutions, for responsible government, for Confederation, and for a share in the making of treaties which concern ourselves as well as the Mother Country. Let us do our own work. As there are not many of our public men capable of doing a more effective share of it than Mr. Longley, let him "decide finally and inexorably what we ought to do," and then take off his coat and show what a public man of decided mind can do. There is a field before him worthy of the noblest ambition.

G. M. GRANT.

### The Canadian Militia.

THE readers of THE WEEK must have perused with much interest the third paper by Principal Grant on the "Cost and Profit of Liberty," that appeared in a recent issue. I am sure that every member of the active militia is pleased to see public men, with the wide-spread influence and great ability of Mr. Grant, discussing a subject that receives but scant attention either from the pulpit or the press.

To accomplish the reorganization or any improvement in the Canadian militia three things are necessary. The first is, that the people of Canada desire an improvement; the second, that they are willing to pay for it; and the third, that the material is at hand to carry on the work.

The discussion of the question by men of known ability and experience, continued for any length of time, will accomplish the first. Everyone who has had any experience with the militia will agree that it is susceptible to improvement, and if we are to have a militia it should be efficient. I am only too conscious that there are difficulties in the way, such as the inability of our soldiers to devote very much of their time from industrial and professional pursuits to training in arms. Still we cannot be charged with carrying this too far in Canada, when twelve days in two years is all the time that is required from the rural corps. Principal Grant would do his country an incalculable service if he wrote a letter every week taking as his text, "Improve the Militia." His voice might also drown the cries so often heard from the pulpit to the effect that it is a sin to be a soldier, a doctrine that is identical with the principles of anarchy.

Politicians always respond to public feeling, and if they are assured that the people desire an efficient militia they will vote the money. The idea of the development of the natural resources of the country by public subsidies is not as popular now as it was a few years ago, and money that has been devoted to the other branches of the public service can be diverted easily into a new channel. For it is well known that the militia department has been stinted for no other reason than that the money might be spent in public works and railways. That was the trouble this year. The heads of departments reached for all they could get and the militia, although well represented in Parliament in the game of grab, had to take the small slice of the pie. The smallness of the slice was not noticed until it was too late and the appropriations to the other departments had been made. No one regretted this more than the members of the Government themselves. It was neither the fault of the Minister of Militia nor the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Militia never feels safe in increasing the expenditure in his department, for there is no telling what moment the expenditure will be denounced as useless. The city corps, however, have been paid their eight days pay, and the pay-sheets for the other four days have been signed and sent in and will be paid as soon as Parliament meets and legalizes the expenditure. It should not be forgotten that \$50,000 was spent this year in purchasing Lee Metford

rifles which helped to drain the treasury. The most efficient regiments with suitable armories and ranges will, no doubt, be armed with these rifles so that the force will receive some immediate benefit from the expenditure and become accustomed to the new arm, instead of having them stored at Ottawa.

Principal Grant thinks that it would be better to have 25,000 efficient militia men than 35,000 inefficient. Such logic is unanswerable, but it is no argument in favour of the reduction of the militia. Militiamen cannot but look with suspicion upon any such a move, for there is no guarantee that the militia would be more efficient with 25,000 than 30,000 men. I have yet to meet the militia officer that did not agree that what would be most needed in case of war would be non-commissioned officers capable of instructing the recruits in drill, discipline, and duties. With a smaller force such material would be diminished. There would be plenty of the raw material available. For that reason I have heard the opinion often expressed that no man should be allowed to remain even as a private in the permanent force who is incapable of imparting instruction in drill and who is not ready at any moment to act in that capacity. More should be done to encourage capable men even in the ranks of the militia to secure the qualifications of instructors. Men who qualify as shots wear with pride the "cross guns," or marksman's badge, on their sleeves. I fail to see any reason why there should not be some such badge for those men who are qualified in this equally important branch of military knowledge. Such men would be invaluable in case of war.

It has been proved time and again that a nation should be able to maintain a standing army of 50,000 men to the million of its population. This figure has been exceeded on many occasions, notably in Germany under Frederick the Great. France, Germany and Russia are not far from these figures now. That would give Canada a war strength of 250,000. Where would the drill instructors and the officers come from? When we compare our expenditure with that which would be required were we to reach this limit, we find that the ratio would be one to three hundred, counting 25,000 militia trained for twelve days in the year. It cannot be argued, therefore, that our expenditure now is excessive, or that it would be even if we drilled 50,000 men for twelve days a year. There must be a much larger expenditure in the near future if we are to have a militia at all. Canada should, by rights, have 50,000 stand of Lee Metford rifles. That would cost \$900,000. Arrangements could be made to distribute the payment over, say twenty years, as it would be a legitimate expenditure on capital account. A large saving could be effected in the matter of uniforms if a stout canvas uniform was provided for drill and fatigue duties during camp. At present the cloth uniforms are heavy and uncomfortable in this climate in summer. The men are required to wear them, and a new tunic, which is supposed to last five years, in reality only sees two camps as the men are drilled twice in five years. I am satisfied that if the men who go to camp carried two uniforms, one for drill and the other for reviews, a great saving could be effected, besides giving greater comfort to the men themselves. A uniform of this description would only cost at the most \$2 per man. The saving might be applied to the purchase of new knapsacks, of the improved Slade-Wallace, or some equipment more modern than the present, which was carried by our great-grandfathers at Waterloo and Lundy's Lane.

I agree with Principal Grant that efficient officers are an absolute necessity in the militia. But I differ from him as to the method to be adopted. Our schools of infantry are every year turning out scores of capable officers, as far as regimental requirements are concerned. The Military College may be a useful institution, but he as much as admits that it is useless to the militia, and I agree with him to some extent. Why do not the graduates enter the service of their country? I cannot answer that. They certainly are not debarred from joining, and the other horn of the dilemma presents the old saw that "One man can take a horse to water, etc." They cannot be compelled to join as the laws of conscription are not in force in Canada. For my part I fail to see where there are any better soldiers than the graduates of the infantry schools. There are a few things that an officer should know. First, he should know his drill. Now,