

the remainder of his career, when the sole result will be that a successor will be put in his place to advocate and sanction the very measures to which he has not been able to reconcile himself.

That these are no mere fanciful considerations is shown by the present position of affairs in relation to the Army. The Committee of Defence is advising Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman just as it advised Mr. Balfour. One would, and should, expect the continuity of policy hoped for by its founders. But there have been drastic changes which were not foreshadowed in the ex-Premier's time. We have before us Mr. Haldane's shadowy scheme for a "National Army," which will leave us, in the event of a serious war, mainly dependent on the Volunteers and an indefinite reserve of potential combatants behind that force. This is opposed in principle to Mr. Arnold-Forster's scheme of a long-service and a short-service Army existing side by side, the latter to supply to the former what was, until Mr. Haldane's day, considered an essential of modern war, namely, a sufficient trained reserve to take the field against European troops. We have seen the suppression of batteries, and the disbanding of a *corps d'élite*, and I personally may own to a feeling of amazement that these steps have obtained even a qualified and regretted sanction from soldiers at the head of their profession. But, in spite of such drastic changes, we have had no resignations of highly placed officers. The problems of Imperial Defence remain the same; yet, though the policy which governs preparation for Imperial Defence undergoes a subversion due to the new values of purely political forces, our Committee of Defence, as might have been foreseen, acquiesces indifferently in the old principles and the new, in the system which was right until the General Election and in the system which is right now that the party in power regards the Services much as Mr. Stiggins regarded Mr. Weller senior.

It is not surprising that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman takes the responsibilities of the Defence Committee lightly.