

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*The Editor does not hold himself responsible for individual expressions of opinion in communications addressed to the VOLUNTEER REVIEW.*

## THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CANADIAN ARMY.

*To the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW.*

SIR:—Your admirable article urging the necessity of a further organization of Field Artillery in the Canadian Militia, leads me to offer, for the information of your readers, a few figures regarding the due proportion of the various arms in the 40,000 Militia required by the Canadian law. For economical reasons these proportions have been neglected hitherto, but as the organization tends towards perfection, it is necessary that the ordinary rule laid down for the Imperial service should be observed. Whilst we had garrisons of Her Majesty's troops and a large proportion of Field Artillery amongst them, shifts could be made to furnish an army with its quota of cavalry and artillery but now that we are thrown on our own resources the existing deficiencies must be supplied.

The distribution that at present exists is as follows:—

Cavalry, 27 Troops, nominal strength..	1666
Field Batteries, 10 (42 guns do ..	750
Garrison Art'y., 70 Batteries, do ..	4108
Engineers, 4 Companies, do ..	232
Infantry & Rifles, 623 Cos., do ..	36,729
Naval, 3 Companies, do ..	174

Total ..... 43,659

Taking the rules laid down in the Imperial service, the proportions should be as follows:—

Cavalry. { Hussars, 39 Troops, 2271 Off's & men	
{ M'd Rifles, 16 " 2702 " "	
Nominal strength 4973 officers and men.	
Field Batteries, 17 (68 guns) or one gun to 600 men.....	1,700
Garrison Batteries, 50.....	5,000
Engineers, 17 Companies.....	1,700
Infantry, Rifles and Marine Cos. ....	26,627

Total..... 40,000

This distribution is based upon the assumption that cavalry should be in the proportion of one-fifth of the infantry; artillery, one gun to 600 men, garrison artillery, sufficient to man the walls of our defensible fortifications; two engineer companies to each district (or division in the field), and the balance infantry and rifles.

To secure this proportion few changes are necessary. Retaining the 22 troops of Hussars at present organized, the addition of 17 troops would give each district from one to three squadrons, and troops of mounted rifles could be easily formed from existing infantry companies. Considering how easily this could be effected, and the natural disposition of the better class of young men in rural districts to prefer the mounted service, the suitability of Canadian horses for such work, and the immense value of mounted rifles in modern warfare, it is singular

that this force has not been encouraged hitherto. According to regulation these troops should consist of 55 officers and men.

The seven field batteries required should be raised by demi batteries or divisions in rural districts. Hitherto they have been confined to cities or large towns where it is difficult to procure horses and men suited for the heavy work of gunners, or sufficiently good horsemen for drivers. The location of a demi battery in a thriving village, the centre of a well populated rural district, would prove a great stimulus to volunteering in the immediate vicinity and be a matter of pride to the whole neighborhood. The batteries would, of course, be united on proceeding into the brigade camps.

As our existing garrison batteries may be said to be infantry in artillery uniform, the 20 batteries existing over the quota required is not a question that needs consideration. It would be well, however, if in the future the duties and uniform should be made to correspond.

The formation of the thirteen engineer companies I look upon as a necessity. Their peculiar duties can be performed by no other arm; and in a country like our own interlaced with railroads, dissected by unfordable streams and abounding in defensible positions, the organized force of skilled artisans is indispensable. True we have them in our ranks, but of what use is a workman without his tools? and though a Canadian woodsman can build a house with his axe and jack knife, he could scarcely repair an engine or mine a bridge with his bayonet. With them also would rest the provision of intrenching tools for the use of the army and the construction of the "Field Telegraph," so universally used in modern warfare. The establishment provided by the Act is insufficient, I have, therefore, fixed the strength of the companies at 100 officers and men.

To effect these changes without materially interfering with the present battalion organization would be the desideratum. As, however, there are 78 independent companies, ranging from two to thirty two in the several military districts—many battalions having an uneven number of companies—many infantry and rifle companies anxious to change into mounted corps, and many, doubtless, who would be eager to join the field artillery; these matters only need careful consideration, judicious management and a rigid apportionment of each arm to the several districts in equal proportions to obviate all the difficulties that could arise in carrying out the required alterations.

The next and most important question is that of expense. Cavalry equipment costs eight times that of infantry. Saddlery is the chief item. Now, in making the suggestion I am about to make, I do not for one moment suppose the McClellan saddle is in any respect equal to our own, but they are serviceable, they are cheap, and they are easily manufactured and repaired. Why

not buy these for our mounted rifles? They can be obtained, in quantities, for from \$3 to \$5 each, and by substituting a *decent looking stirrup*, and some slight alterations in the mode of placing the blankets, they would neither injure the horses back nor the seat of the rider. At any rate "half a loaf is better than no bread," and a mounted rifleman armed with a Martini carbine and revolvers, his McClellan saddle judiciously arranged, a stout halter bridle with Pelham bit, and reins strong enough to be used for picketing or tying, his trousers tucked into serviceable knee boots, with hunting spurs strapped on, would, if rough looking, prove a formidable enemy and a serviceable friend. His errand being to march on horseback and fight on foot, he should be encumbered with no useless trappings (sabres for instance) his uniform should be of the plainest, and his accoutrements of the lightest, a small service pouch or ball bag would contain his ammunition, his reserve being carried on his horse, from whom he would never be long parted, his peculiar duty being sudden surprises, flank movements and skirmishing. Such I would fain see the Canadian "Uhlán" and I have no doubt but that in case of war he would prove a most useful ally. The subject is worthy of consideration at any rate.

I have dwelt at length on the formation of mounted riflemen, because it has long been my peculiar hobby, and now that we have for Adjutant General an old "Cape Mounted" Rifleman, I am in hopes that our anomalous "mounted infantry," deficient as they are in equipment, improperly as they are accoutred, and ridiculously as they are dressed, for the services they would be called upon to perform, will cease to arouse the jibe and jest of their less conspicuous comrades as they this year have done at our Brigade Camps.

Nov. 15th, 1871.

CENTURION.

*To the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW.*

SIR:—That I have not followed up my letter of Aug. 21st must not be attributed to a sense of defeat, (although your able and well-considered reply might well have caused a less stubborn and self-convinced opponent to strike his flag) but to my willingness to submit my opinions to the test you propose, and leave to the re-enrolment the task of verifying my opinions. But I owe your Typos a grudge for making me say C's. (Companies) instead of C. O's. (Commanding Officers); Assistant Comm'ny instead of "Commissary" General; Paymaster instead of "Quartermaster" General's Department, and for sundry orthographical and etymological errors which do not, however, affect the sense of the article and, moreover, being seized with *cacoethes scribendi* (I implore the d—l to render me intelligible) I again seek your columns. First of all let me remark that I have been considerably disappointed, not to say chagrined, that the matters suggested in my