

stores—arms, ammunition and clothing, all of which are products of native industry and the property of

unemployed.* The argument is, therefore, narrowed to the good or bad effect of military employment on men in the service, and to the utility or the harmfulness of maintaining a largo army.

As to the utility of an army, if used for its military purpose only, that utility must be, in a considerable measure, dependent upon the circumstances of the nation. The value of a well-founded feeling of security, whether on the part of an individual or of a nation, should not be lightly esteemed. The difference between a nation . . feeling, on the one hand, that all *may be safe*, and that, even if certain untoward eventualities should place it in apparent jeopardy, good fortune and able management *might suffice* to carry it through perils which have proved disastrous and fatal to others . . and feeling, on the other hand, that by the completeness of its preparations and fullness of its defensive power, it is practically secured from serious danger, however suddenly and unexpectedly the necessity for the exercise of defensive power may arise, is very great. A nation in a chronic state of incertitude as to its ability to do, and of unreadiness to do at the right time, that which it feels and knows that it ought to do, is, to say the very least, not in a condition of robust health: and, should there be, behind this, any degree of fear or nervous apprehension as to the consequences of endeavouring to fulfil its duties and maintain its

* That is to say: the number of the unemployed is diminished by the number of the additional soldiers.