

sonal reference to themselves: "This appointment of young men, scarcely known among the workers of the force, simply because they are Mr. Somebody's constituents, or Mr. Somebody Else's grandsons, ignoring well trained and capable men, would have been all very well in the days of George the III."

* * *

All that we can say is that if the cap fits it is not our fault. It would probably fit most of such appointees, and we, nor anybody else having the best interest of the militia at heart have been so far able to help it.

* * *

It is just possible that the country will, later, have cause to congratulate itself on having obtained the services of these two particular gentlemen, but to say that there exists now, such cause for self congratulation by a grateful country is most nonsensical flattery. It is possible that they may prove as capable officers, and as bright ornaments to the militia service as such men as Wilson, Short, Peters, Rutherford, Drury and several other of the past and present officers of the Regiment of Canadian Artillery who did not have the benefit of training at the Royal Military College, but their record to date has not been such as to merit particular attention or to quite overwhelm the country with gratitude towards them. They may turn out all right, and all the other gentlemen who get appointments to the permanent corps may earn the gratitude of the country by their valuable services, but the country would run less risk of disappointment if they had had the training of professional soldiers when they joined the permanent service, for unfortunately all the political favour appointees previously favoured have not been unqualified successes, as the many efficient officers of the permanent corps know to their cost.

* * *

The simplicity of the Chronicle, considering what a hardened old sinner of a political hack it is, is simply refreshing. "At this date," it says, "it is absurd to talk about commissions being obtained through the exercise of influence of one sort or another." A great many good people, who have not such good opportunities of keeping posted on the unswerving devotion of our politicians to the spoils system, had begun to hope that the day had come when something else besides political exigency and the personal favour of politicians would determine the selection of men for the public service. But the Chronicle was not likely to make this mistake. If these appointments were

not obtained through the exercise of influence, why were they made?

* * *

Allow us to remark here that the Military Gazette does not whine, nor does it propose to whine for the Royal Military College, and in openly attacking this appointment jobbing business, it is actuated merely by the desire to benefit the service of which it strives, to the best of its ability, to be the outspoken mouth-piece. If we argue for the adoption of the principle that graduates of the Royal Military College should receive the commissions in the permanent force in preference to young inexperienced officers in the volunteer militia, whose only particular qualifications for the service are their family connections and a useful political pull, it is not the Military College we are concerned about so much as the welfare of the service of which that excellent institution is an adjunct.

* * *

Passing over the frothy and uncalled for attack on what the writer in the Chronicle considers the personalities of our article, it is perhaps just as well in the interest of lucidity to merely draw attention to the fact that the writer in the Chronicle writes a deliberate falsehood when he quotes our writer as saying that "he knew nothing of the gentlemen under his pen." The Chronicle winds up its performance with that hackneyed old feat of acrobatic logic, namely praising the work of the Royal Military College and at the same time arguing against the employment of its graduates in the service for which they are trained. Our contemporary says: "We applaud with all our might the good results of the R.M.C. but, all the same, it would be a most tyrannous thing, if young men seeking a military career, and showing aptitude for that profession, and being able to pass the necessary examinations, were debarred from holding a commission in our regular army merely because they had not been trained at Kingston. The Minister of Militia should not be restricted in his choice of officers by any hard and fast cast-iron rule."

* * *

By the way we never advocated the debarring of young men other than graduates of the Royal Military College from commissions in the permanent service. On the contrary we said very distinctly in the article in question: "We would not go to the length of saying that the officers of the Active Militia should be shut out altogether from the chance of obtaining commissions in the permanent corps, but certainly, so long as there is

any chance of obtaining the services of capable graduates of the Royal Military College no commission in the permanent force should be allotted to an officer in the Active Militia without he has markedly distinguished himself in some way, or has given unmistakeable evidence of rare military genius."

* * *

The Chronicle's writer, however, proceeds to give arguments against the fixing of a rule that none but graduates of Kingston should get the commissions in the permanent service, which, of course, is not the question at all. However these arguments are so amusing as to merit reproduction. This is how the article proceeds: "We are quite willing to say that the College is an excellent school, and that very many capable young men are annually turned out of that institution exceedingly well equipped. Four at least, per annum, are allotted to commissions in the British army, and other plums are continually falling into the laps of the smart cadets. Others, by reason of their superior education in the science of engineering, find ready employment in civil life, both here and in the United States, to which latter country, a good many repair, we grieve to say every little while." * * *

* * *

"A Military College bred man should take his chances like other young Canadian gentlemen. He has opportunities, appointments to posts in the Imperial army for instance,—which are denied to those who do not study at Kingston. The Minister must not be hampered. He has the whole country to administer in a military sense, and in the selection of his officers, all things being equal, his range should not be limited to the graduates of one institution, however expensive that institution may be, however brilliant the cadets may be. * * * We are naturally proud of our Military College, and the work that it accomplishes but its cadets cannot have the earth. They get their share of the good things."

* * *

This is the sort of thing we have always been used to when the question of the Royal Military College graduates and appointments in the permanent force has been discussed. It is a simple case of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. One eighth of the money voted for the maintenance of the militia is spent on the college. Either the money is well spent or it is not. If well spent then from the college must flow some benefit to the militia service, of inadequate funds, of which it absorbs such a large