

TELEGRAPH, one year, purse \$3. 7th. Corp. Cooper, stove, purse \$3. 8th. Private Harrison, box soap, purse \$2. 9th. Corp. Tarleton, pair boots, purse \$2 50. 10th. Col. Sergt. McCormick, 1 cord wood, purse \$2 50. 11th. Captain Morrison, lamp, purse \$2. 12th. Sergt. Jose, ham, purse \$2 50. 13th. Priv. —, vest, purse \$2 50. 14th. Sergt. Villiers, album, purse \$2 50. 15th. Priv. Musgrove, box cigars, purse \$2 50. 16th. Priv. Purdy, merchandise pipe and case. 17th. Corp. Campbell, spirit flask. After the presentation the company repaired to the Queen's Own Hotel, King street, where refreshments were provided. The officers and men of No. 2 Company tendered their thanks to the several persons who subscribed to the rifle match — *Toronto Telegraph*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW:

SIR: The Ottawa Times of the 30th ult. contains an article entitled, "Defence, Ways and Means," which is calculated to convey very erroneous impressions, indeed, of the heroic struggle Canadian settlers of French and British origin maintained, successfully, against the unjust pretensions of the United States, backed by the whole power or prestige of the French Empire, in the war of 1812-15.

It is one of those articles calculated to do a great deal of mischief from the moderation and meekness of tone assumed. It asserts that "in 1812 the Americans rushed into long meditated war with Britain with four frigates, seven sloops, and six thousand men; and that with these tiny forces they achieved a greater number of victories over the British at sea than the French did during the whole course of the revolutionary war, and baffled on land the veteran troops of the Peninsula."

Now, sir, it is impossible to conceive more culpable or careless misrepresentation condensed in fewer lines. The writer had, evidently, never read a work published at Ottawa, in 1864, entitled, "1812, a Chronicle of the War—by Lieut. Col. W. F. Coffin," or he would have hesitated before he stamped American statesmen as a parcel of incapable imbeciles, and attempted to lower the dignity of these Provinces by the assertion that they had to oppose the efforts of madmen.

On page 27 of that book, while defining the right of declaring the port of an enemy in a state of blockade, the following sensible remarks occur: "Constructive blockade was an innovation in the enginery of war. It was blockading *run mad*. The right to blockade an enemy's port in time of actual warfare had been perfectly understood, so long as the blockade was effectual and complete, but the blockade declared by England was of countries, not specific ports, and was declared to exist whether such countries were blockaded or not. England justified her course by contending that, as Mistress of the seas, having one thousand ships of war afloat, she practically blockaded the whole world."

Now, sir, the writer in the Times asserts that with the "tiny" force enumerated, the

American people not only rushed into war with a power whose smallest squadron could easily annihilate their whole naval force, but that they actually achieved important victories.

What the object of such teaching may be, it is not for me to inquire, but its effects are sufficiently obvious, and these are, that notwithstanding all physical or other laws to the contrary, the people of Canada, like the victims of Polyphemus, are graciously reserved to the last, and will only be devoured by the monster Republic when pressed by hunger or as a *bonne bouche*.

It is well known that at the commencement of this most unjustifiable war on the part of the United States administration (for the people had nothing to do with it), the whole force for the defence of Canada was 4,450 regular soldiers and 3,800 militia-men; and of this force 1,460 regular soldiers and 1,800 militiamen bore the brunt of the onset of 25,000 United States soldiers in Upper Canada, on which the first fury of invasion fell.

It is not my intention to analyze the article of the writer in the Times, but to set at rest an assertion so detrimental to the military prowess of the British colonies on this continent.

The most brilliant page in the military history of Great Britain is the defence of Canada in the war of 1812-15, the Crimean Campaign and the Indian Mutiny to the contrary notwithstanding, because both of these gallant episodes were the work of practiced and trained soldiers, with all necessary equipments.

The defence of Canada was effected by militia-men, nine tenths of whom never stood in line nor fired a shot at a mightier foe than a squirrel, till the day they had to confront the well trained and carefully organized American battalions; and how they did their duty, let Chateauguay and Lundy's Lane tell. Inexperienced, unequipped, and without one of the circumstances of glorious war, the Canadian militia met a foe carefully trained and amply provided, outnumbering them in the proportion of ten to one; and at the close of the contest that foe did not possess a square rod of Canadian territory.

As to the naval victories, the Americans captured a very few vessels in single combat; but the result was that their maritime interests were annihilated. The correspondent of the Times has never read the famous John Randolph's description of the only effectives of the American navy, the celebrated "gunboats," which he declares were built to run up a creek *stern foremost* on the approach of danger.

At the close of the war between 1793 and 1815, the British had captured and destroyed of French, Dutch, Spanish, Danish, Russian, Turkish, and American vessels, 1,261, carrying 29,869 guns, and sustained a loss by capture or otherwise of 166 vessels, mounting 3,017 guns. Of American vessels

captured, three were added to the British navy. Will the Times' correspondent inform the public how many British vessels were added to the American navy?

I would not have trespassed on your valuable space, Mr. Editor, if I did not feel it my duty as an *old salt*, to put this matter in its proper light before the people of these Provinces.

A new constitutional era has dawned on us. The maintenance of our independence is necessary to our future prosperity, and to that end an efficient Militia force must be provided; but it is certainly a queer way to set about the organization by degrading the prowess of the people who must compose that force.

From the crude proposals floating about in the official and semi-official organs, it would appear as if we were to have a repetition of Colonel Lyson's bill relative to the organization of the Militia. Knowing the temper of the people well, I have no hesitation in saying that such a measure will fail, and that it will be killed by what the correspondent of the Times calls the *cadre* or staff.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,
BENBOW.

To the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW:

RICHMOND, Oct. 28.

SIR: The payment of the Volunteers is a matter I often hear discussed, and so should it be, but what seems strange to me is that paying the officers for their services is scarcely thought of. I believe this is an evil that should be remedied. My reasons are these. The officers especially in rural battalions or companies are not able to afford the outlay and loss of time which is necessary to the good working of their companies. In fact, a great number are not, so well able to afford the loss of time and money as the rank and file are. An officer may be a loyal man and wish for the welfare of his company, and will spend time and money until his means will no longer allow him to do so: hence the great number of resignations, and still a greater evil, viz., the Captains of Companies expending the allowance they receive for armories, and devoting a share of the men's pay to their own use, thereby causing a general dissatisfaction among the men, and making the arms entirely useless for want of cleaning, thus leaving the companies in almost a disorganized state. In my opinion this might be remedied by paying the officers according to their rank, for their services at least, if not allowing something in lieu of clothing. For instance, take all the officers of a Battalion, say of six companies, and you don't find three in possession of a full dress uniform, or perhaps one half in possession of the undress. The men are loyal and willing, I believe, but their means don't allow them to appear as they should. It is to be hoped that the Adjutant General in forming his new Militia Bill, will not overlook this very important fact.

Yours, etc.,
SEBALTEN.