

tinuing his attack on Colonel Otter. I trow not, for anyone can see that he insulted the D.A.G., but is now trying to create the impression that his fight is with his own Colonel.

Colonel Dawson got the opinion of the best authority in the Royal Grenadiers, Capt. Bruce, President of the Rifle Association. You are incorrect in saying that Capt. Manley had a right to be consulted. He had no more claim than any other officer or any man who shoots in the regiment. The right to consult rested with the Colonel, and he simply did not think it necessary to consult Captain Manley. But Capt. Manley, with infinite assurance, denies that Colonel Dawson represents his regiment in this matter, because he (Colonel Dawson) did not get the individual opinion of his officers, while he (Capt. Manley) claims that he represents his company (42 men,) although he could not have got their individual opinion, for he admits that he knew nothing of the proposed site, and if he knew nothing about it, he could not have got the opinion of his company about it.

In reply to your strictures, I would say that there is nothing of the high and mighty in Colonel Dawson, but on the contrary if he has a fault it is that he errs on the side of good nature, and I am sure his officers will stand beside him in this matter.

Let me say in concluding, that this letter has been written without the knowledge of any of the gentlemen interested.

LXXX.

COL. DAWSON SATISFIED.

Ald. Score yesterday received the following letter from Col. Dawson of the Grenadiers:

With reference to the proposed site for the rifle range: In the *Mail* of Friday last, the 27th Nov., Capt. Manley is reported as saying to your committee: "The commanding officer of the Royal Grenadiers was not satisfied with the site," also "that Col. Dawson had not heard of it." Now, I beg to say that Capt. Manley had no authority for making these statements, as on the contrary I have always been in favour of a lake range, and expressed this opinion some time ago in the committee appointed by the Major-General commanding the militia to settle upon a site. On this committee I was representing the Royal Grenadiers.

(From the News, 27th November)

The Mayor and Ald. Score have determined that the new ranges must be located on the lake shore west of Mimico. Col. Otter has apparently joined the gentlemen named in an effort to secure the same result. But, on the other hand Capt. Manley, who declares he speaks for the men who practice on the ranges, says the selection is not suitable. In the first place the site chosen is a long way off, being 13 miles distant, and can only be reached by one line of railway, and that running from the Union Station. To reach the place in question most of the volunteers would require to travel by street car to the station, and then pay fare by rail to the ranges, the lowest estimate for the latter being 12c for the round trip. Here then is a total of at least 15c for fares every time a rifleman visits the ranges.

Another objection is that the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company has already registered plans for a line running through the site chosen. As soon as the railway is built the ranges will be rendered useless. Then again, there is an immense lake traffic during the season when shooting is on to and from Toronto to Oakville and Hamilton. Every time a shot is fired those on the pleasure craft near the shore will be endangered. The distance, difficulty of access, and the fact that the public safety would be endangered by the use of the ranges are all against them. Under these circumstances it cannot but be expected that the volunteers will vote down the by-law to raise the money required to purchase the site picked upon.

What will result? The present ranges will be retained for another year and perhaps longer, and this is just what Col. Otter desires. That gentleman has always opposed,

bitterly opposed, the removal of the ranges from their present location, and it is not inconceivable that he has given his apparent sanction to the selection of the Mimico site hoping that its unsuitability will be so apparent as to ensure the retention of the present one, at least for a time.

(From the World, 30th Nov.)

Editor World: My name has been freely used in the press in connection with the rifle range question. As false impressions have been conveyed, let me, much against my inclination, "rush into print" to explain my position.

In the first place, it matters not a straw to me where the range may be located. I only desire to see the volunteers of Toronto supplied with a range that they can enjoy forever; and I defy anyone to prove that I ever approached any of the committee in favour of any particular locality. I am reported to have said that Col. Otter does not voice the opinion of the volunteers of the city. As this may be misconstrued, let me say that I have more confidence in the opinion of Col. Otter in things military than in that of any other officer in Toronto. I mean to say, however, that up to the present, as their views have not been obtained on the question, he does not and can not voice their opinions. I may be bold enough to say that my experience in rifle shooting and on rifle ranges entitled me to an opinion in this matter. Such was never asked, and I never advanced it, to any of those on the committee. If the officers of the different corps had been called together, and all the facts of the case laid before them, I should not have been present at the Parks and Gardens meeting at the City Hall. I was completely ignorant of what was coming up at that meeting and was astounded to hear a site proposed that I knew nothing of. I stated that Col. Dawson did not approve of the range. How could he? He had never seen it, and I am almost certain that none of his officers, and very few of his men, had even heard of the exact locality. Col. Dawson states in the *Globe* that before going to the meeting I should have consulted him or Col. Otter. What about? As I said before, I did not know what was forthcoming. It was not my duty, at any rate, to intrude myself uninvited on either Col. Otter or Col. Dawson. My commanding officer says he always preferred a lake range. So have I, provided we can obtain one that will not be objected to on the question of safety, and one easy and cheap of access. Before the question can be settled all the facts bearing on the matter should be submitted. Let me state a few points for example: How long will it take to go to the several proposed ranges? Can at least 1200 yards be obtained at any? What will be the fare? What about the price? These, Mr. Editor, are vital questions and can be answered before a choice is made. Why do I speak of 1200yds? I may be asked. Considering the great improvements being made in the English rifles, such a distance will soon be necessary on any well-equipped range; but if we cannot obtain it we must do without it. It is said great secrecy was necessary on account of land speculation. These men must submit to arbitration, and cannot get one cent more than their land is worth. I am stated to have made a threat about the voting down of the by-law if submitted. I merely stated that it would be well before submitting it, to have the volunteers behind the back of the committee: in other words, let them know the answers of the above questions. Finally, as far as I am personally concerned, and I voice the sentiments of at least 42 non-commissioned officers and men of the Royal Grenadiers, I am ready to support the best range, and if on the basis I have suggested, it shall be found that the range proposed at the Parks and Gardens Committee meeting be the best available, I shall be only too glad to hold up both hands and voice in its favour.

I trust that the importance of the case may excuse the freedom I have taken with your columns.

FRED E. MANLEY, Capt., Royal Grenadiers.