

CORRESPONDENCE.

WINTER CAMPAIGNING IN CANADA.

To the Editor of THE VOLUNTEER REVIEW:

SIR,—The Review of the 23rd December contains a well written article on "Winter Campaigning," which deserves serious consideration. It is quite possible that the Fenians would be mad enough to make a dash at Canada during the winter, for the purpose of securing "half an acre" of soil on which to found an Irish Republic, and equally probable that such occupation, if allowed to exist for forty-eight hours, would furnish a class of American statesmen with a pretext to recognize the filibusters as belligerents. Therefore the advice contained in the article alluded to is worthy of attention, and is evidently the result of a mind having a correct knowledge of the country and climate obtained by close observation. The mode of defence recommended is one exactly suitable to the condition of the country and people—the only drawback being that our organization has not been prepared to meet the contingency anticipated.

As the Volunteer Force now exists it is concentrated about the cities and large towns and villages; few corps belonging to the rural districts; and it is precisely at points on the Frontier, removed from the cities or large villages, that such an attempt as that named will be made. The writer of the article thinks that "some point on the Frontier near Montreal," will be the objective point of the Fenian leaders; and there is more than probability in the idea. A landing anywhere West of Prescott would remove the assailants too far from their base of operations; no end whatever except utter annihilation could be subserved thereby. But a movement *below Prescott* at many points on Canadian Territory would secure every advantage necessary for their object, and be sufficiently removed from molestation to secure all the moral effect requisite. The admirable plan of "*Trente-Septieme*" would be useless to prevent or avert such a consummation—because no organization exists to carry it out; and that supplied by the present system is utterly inefficient. In 1866 the invasion at Fort Erie succeeded because no attention was paid to the organization of the local militia, and the Fenians held a territory (on which 20,000 volunteers could have been concentrated in twenty-four hours if a proper militia law had been in force) till students from Toronto and clerks from retail stores in Hamilton were brought up to deliver the stalwart farmers of Welland and Lincoln and their sons from the Filibusters. How well that duty was performed is a matter of history, and it is needless to advert to the gallantry which led a lot of lads to confront with the steadiness of veterans, an enemy, whose strength and position were unknown. The fact is indisputable that Canada escaped a real danger on that occasion, and it behoves her rulers to be warned

in time. Above all things it is necessary to provide for the defence of the country in such a manner that no portion of its shores should be polluted by invaders without finding an armed and organized population ready to receive them—and this cannot be effected by the present Volunteer organization or any modification thereof. With a stringent militia law, equipping and arming every man capable of service, armed raids on any part of Canada would be impossible; and even if a landing in force was effected the invaders would have to fight for every foot of territory they occupied—losing strength as they advanced—while the defenders, like a snow ball, would be gaining force and proportion as they fell back. In this case "*Trente-Septieme*'s" suggestions would be invaluable.

I am, Sir,

Your obedt. servt.,
SCHAULTER.

To the Editor of THE VOLUNTEER REVIEW:

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to thank you for your candid review of my pamphlet on "Ireland as it is &c.," and at the same time to offer a few remarks on one or two points in your article, which I deem deserving of such. You agree with me in some conclusions which I have arrived at, in the pamphlet in question; and, you disagree with me in others. This is natural enough, for no two minds of men on earth are constituted alike. Where you agree with me, your judgment strengthens me in my opinions; but, where you disagree with me, since you do not prove to me that I am wrong, you leave me confirmed in my convictions.

In your review you assert that "the very evils I denounce were created and perpetuated by the Irish themselves." This is only an assumption on your part Sir, for you do not undertake to verify the assertion by fact, and, therefore, it is no argument and contains no force. You also say that a large and influential portion of the Irish people themselves are indignant at the idea of the abolition of the Church and State connection. You are aware, Sir, that the "Irish people" are divided into two classes—division has been their bane—Protestant and Catholic; the one the minority and in the ascendancy; the other the majority, but singularly enough in the position of a minority. You do not say which class it is that is indignant. You evidently refer to the prejudiced portion of the Protestant class, as is only natural to be supposed; for it is not a fact that any of the Catholic class are indignant at the idea of the abolition of the Church and State connection; and it is their feelings we have to look to as only on their corns does the shoe pinch.

Now to another point. You certainly did not understand me on page 18 of my pamphlet, to say, that I justified Fenianism in Ireland or anywhere else, in its physical force proceedings. I only justify the exist-

ence in Ireland of a moral force Fenianism for the legal redress of Irish wrongs. You yourself, Sir, approve of this moral force Fenianism in Ireland—all healthy and unbiased minds approve of it—and, therefore, between you and I, on this subject of Fenianism in Ireland there is no difference of opinion.

Allow me to say that your expressions of confidence in the loyalty of Irishmen in Canada, do credit to your judgment and liberality; and they contrast strongly with the rabid mouthings of designing demagogues, who for the gratification of some petty personal grievance, or the pacification of the cravings of a depraved nature, endeavor to blacken Irish loyalty in Canada, in the public mind, and to sow the seeds of discord and disunion in our midst.

With you, Sir, I agree that the united efforts of the people of Canada, must be put forth to repel any immediate invasion of this country, from whatever source; but, if invasion comes on as from no fault of our own: if it costs us millions of money and a large expenditure of precious life, will you, Sir, not candidly agree with me, that it is our duty as a people, alive to our peace and prosperity, to endeavor to strike at the cause from which springs our trouble? You are too much of a philosopher to believe that our tinkering with a consequence can avail, while its cause remains and is unassailed.

In conclusion let me refer to your closing remarks, in which you playfully endeavor at my expense, to have a little fun, on what you conceive to be an "obfuscation of ideas" on my part, while in "the region of metaphor." Let us be funny together, and not quarrel over a joke like the fox and the stork did. Concerning this "obfuscation of ideas" you say: "On page 17 he is decidedly absurd in his mistiness when he says: 'If the British Government would but awake to a sense of common justice—and to the summit of moral excellence and at once apply the axe to the root of Irish disaffection, . . . agitation would become extinct &c.' " The italics are yours, Sir, and are intended I presume to denote the "obfuscated ideas." You have read of the astronomer who having a little fly in his telescope unawares, on making an observation of the Sun, swore by the eternal gods, that there was an extraordinary monster in the great luminary. He was mistaken of course; and, is it not quite possible, Sir, that a similar accident has befallen you concerning those "obfuscated ideas" of mine? Have you not construed a mental operation, Sir, into a physical action, and thereby like the fly-baffled astronomer fallen into a mistake? I think that is what you have done, and if there be any "obfuscation" in the matter, I fancy, Sir, it owes its paternity to yourself. To rise to "the summit of moral excellence" does not imply an ascent of the body and soul of the British Government, to the Olympian or any other height—which would necessitate a very long axe-handle indeed, if it were really to chop