

fixed, blankets properly put on, and that they have their proportion of ammunition. When any work of defence is carrying on the officers are all to attend to see in what manner such works are traced and perfected, that on any emergency they may be able of themselves to protect their posts from insult by the aid of breastworks made of earth, fascines or logs. The love of knowledge ought to be a sufficient inducement. The character of the regiment, the Colonel hopes, every body has at heart."

(To be Continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHATHAM, 24th July, 1868.

To the Editor of THE VOLUNTEER REVIEW.

SIR:—I notice a paragraph in your issue of the 20th inst., taken from the *Montreal Gazette*, viz:—"The officers of the Kent Battalion, now concentrated for Drill, give their attention principally to holding Courts Martial for trying cases of insubordination, a Captain and Lieutenant are included among the refractory." With reference to the foregoing, I beg to state that there is not a word of truth in it; on the contrary, both officers and men conducted themselves in the most exemplary manner. The individual who could circulate such a falsehood is certainly no friend of the Volunteer, therefore should be tried by Court Martial and condemned accordingly. The Battalion mustered 350 officers, non-commissioned officers and men, and will certainly compare favorably with any Battalion in the Dominion.

I am yours truly,

FRONT RANK.

BELLVILLE, July 20th, 1868.

To the Editor of THE VOLUNTEER REVIEW.

SIR:—In your issue of the 13th July, you comment upon what you term a "dispute between the Adjutant General and the Editor of the *Bellville Intelligencer*, and in several instances mention me by name, in such a manner as to render it necessary for me to reply. I doubt not you will permit that reply to go before those readers who have read your article.

After stating that *The Intelligencer* had given a "flat denial" to the assertions of the Adjutant General in his oratorical display in Toronto, you add, "but as the charges made by the Adjutant General can easily be affirmed or confuted by the speeches of Mr. Bowell in the House of Commons, we leave our readers to draw their own conclusions, merely observing that the Adjutant General was perfectly correct in at least one or two of his assertions, to our own personal knowledge." By what parity of reasoning the charges of the Adjutant General against *The Intelligencer* can be "affirmed or confuted" by my speeches in Parliament. I know not, and therefore, must leave that task to the gentlemen of the staff whose superior

tactics are visible in the article before me. Fearing however that these speeches might not justify the assertions of the Adjutant General you volunteer your evidence, and with the most perfect nonchalance, affirm that that officer "was correct in at least one or two of his assertions;" but you don't vouchsafe to enlighten your readers what these "one or two assertions" are. As you have not done so, I do not hesitate to state that none of the assertions in reference to *The Intelligencer*, made by the Adjutant General, in his speech in Toronto, are correct; on the contrary, every statement made by him in that connection was incorrect, and could only have been the utterances of a man oblivious of passing events, or whose passion controlled his judgment. With what did he charge *The Intelligencer*? With stating that the measures taken for the defence of the country were all moonshine—that the volunteer force was a myth, and its equipment a sham—and that it would be impossible to collect a respectable body of volunteers in its ranks. If these charges are true there can be no difficulty in proving them by extracts from the article to which he alluded, instead of dealing in mere declamation and invective, not having done so, I do not hesitate to say, that the man who could so far forget what was due to truth and honor, as to give utterances to such expressions, at a place where he knew I was not present to reply, for the purpose of casting a reflection upon a volunteer officer, proves him to be utterly unworthy of the high position he holds in the militia force of the country.

The attempt which has been made by the Adjutant General, and now supplimented by yourself, to prove that my course in Parliament was actuated by "personal pique" and "personal spleen," is wholly unjustifiable, and without one particle of evidence to sustain it. During over ten years connection with the force, I have never had the slightest difference, dispute or unkind word with any gentleman connected with the militia staff; on the contrary, my intercourse with those of the staff with whom I have been brought in contact has been of the most friendly and agreeable character. True, I have not the honor of an intimate acquaintance with any of the Adjutant Generals, but have served upon the frontier for four months under Lt. Col. Osborne Smith, and for a short time under Lt. Col. Atcherley, with whom no difficulties ever occurred either directly or indirectly; yet to add to the weight of the charge of "personal pique," brought by the Adjutant General, you state—"we have been informed by a gentleman whose word we cannot doubt, that on the occasion of a dispute between the Mr. B. referred to and a member of the militia staff, the former declared that he would remember him when an opportunity offered." And you continue, "this opportunity was obtained at the passage of the militia bill, when the House of Commons was in full glow of re-

trenchment, and Mr. B., true to his promise, moved the resolution curtailing the salaries of the militia staff." This charge, like others previously made, is equally incorrect. I never had a "dispute" with any member of the militia staff, and consequently could not have made any such threat. In conversation with the Minister of Militia, members of the staff, and Volunteer officers, I freely and honestly expressed my convictions that the staff was unnecessarily large and expensive, and that it ought to be reduced, but no such language as that attributed to me was upon any occasion used. In my place in Parliament I gave utterances to those opinions, and assisted in obtaining, if not all I could have wished, certain reductions in the expenses of that staff. If my statements were incorrect why did not the Adjutant General put his superiors in possession of the facts to contradict them, instead of labouring as he and his supporters have done for the past two or three months to convince the country that I was actuated by personal motives in the course I pursued as a representative of the people?

You also say "it is more than probable that a paltry personal grievance will be magnified by Mr. Bowell." Here again you are in error; I have no personal grievance with any member of the militia staff, nor with the Militia Department to "magnify," though this is the fact, it is no reason why I should continue to permit the Adjutant General to magnify and repeat his charges without contradiction, for it is quite evident that this officer and those who support him in this matter, which support is confined to the *Montreal Gazette* and *Volunteer Review*, are endeavoring to fasten upon me, "personal pique," as the motive which actuates me in my endeavors to curtail what I and nine-tenths of those who know any thing about the militia organization of the country, believe to be an utterly useless expenditure of the people's money. I repeat I have no quarrel with the gentlemen who compose the staff, nor do I say they are not qualified for their position, nor that they are not brave and good officers, but what I do believe is, that they are unnecessarily numerous for the labor to be performed, and that the money spent upon them might with much more propriety be expended in properly remunerating the men who compose the force: and if in lending my aid to save over \$6,000 per annum to the country, in this particular alone, I am to receive the outpourings of the wrath of the Adjutant General, and those who were effected by that saving, I am quite content; but of one thing they may rest assured, that anything they may say, or do, will not deter me in future, in assisting to make the militia force in this country effective at as little useless expenditure as possible.

I have the honor to be Sir,

Your obedient servant,

M. BOWELL.