Friday, January 31, 1908,

VICTORIA SEMI-WEEKLY COLONIST

-----

A second and an and a second as a second a CITIZEN'S DUTY IN DEFENCE

HE twelfth meeting of the National Defence Association, the first of the present session, was held on Monday, November 18, 1907, at the Imperia Restaurant, Regent Street, London, at 7.30 p.m., Colonel the Earl of Erroll, K. T., in the chair. There were 25 members present. At 9 p.m. the Chairman, having given the toast, "The King," which was duly honored, said: "Gentlemen, when we elected our President for the following year

this afternoon, Sir George Goldie, he had come upon him as "a blue." When I arrived here this aid that bolt from the blue." evening I had no idea I should have to take the chair, and I can assure you that it came upon me as "a bolt from the blue." Now considering the sort of day we have had, I think two "bolts from the blue" in one day in our changeable climate is rather above the average: I merely mention this in case I may fall short in my duties as the Chairman. I am not a ready speaker, who can talk upon any subject at any moment or at any time, and I think it would have been kinder if our Secretary, Mr. Johnson, had given me a little more time to invent a few impromptus. Now we must get to business. We have received letters from Lord Iveagh and Sir Gilbert Parker, both of whom were ked here as our guests tonight, expressing their sin-re regret that engagements prevent them from atding the dinner

ΓI

We are lucky tonight in having Mr. Dawson to d a paper for us. You are probably all aware that Dawson is the author of the book called "The sage," which, no doubt, most of you have read. is going to read us a paper on "The Citizen's Duty Defence," and, in view of the discussion which fol-s. I shall be obliged if while he is speaking those ulemen who wish to take part in it will send me up is, I shall be obliged II while he is speaking those allemen who wish to take part in it will send me up ir names. I think it has been the rule, or the cus-a rather, that any speeches after the Paper has en read should be more or less circumscribed in to. I think there was some limit laid down—wheth-five or ten minutes I do not know—but as there a very small gathering here tonight, no doubt the akkers won't keep us up too late.

akers won't keep us up too late. I shall have much pleasure now in introducing Mr. wson and asking him to read his Paper. (Hear, r, and applause.) refacing his remarks by some admiring references

Canada and Canadians, Mr. Dawson continued:

Lord Erroll, my Lords and Gentlemen: A few months ago I was enjoying the highly in-structive privilege of travelling through a country which contains within its own frontiers one-third of the entire area of the British Empire. The best kind of patriotism is, happily, a characteristic of the peo-ple of that great country; and they are also endowed with a gift of eloquence, and a fondness for using it, which to me was very striking. On one occasion, just as I was getting into bed on a transcontinental train, I received an urgent invitation from a gentle-man who had boarded the train at our last stopping place, to address a gathering at breakfast next morn-ing, in a well-known agricultural centre, on the sub-ject of "The Commercial Prospects of the Great West."

lect of "The Commercial Prospects of the Great West." I explained, while endeavoring to cover up my pyla-mas, that I knew very little of commerce, and less of the "Great West." towards which we were speeding at that moment. But, with characteristic cheerfulness, my visitor proceeded to reassure me with the airy remark that "Oh, well, you know, outsiders always see most of the game!" Well, I am glad to be able to say that I did not allow this excuse to lead me into atempting an ad-dress on the "Commercial Prospects of the Great West;" but, gentlemen, relying trustfully on your courteous indugence, I do now put this forward as the best justification I can suggest for my temerity in addressing the distinguished and—I am afraid— tery learned company which is gathered together here tonight; just this—that the veriest of the game which escape the attention of the players, and the experts, and the workers, and others whose positions are nearer to the heart of affairs. I believe, gentlemen, that there are circumstances

are nearer to the heart of affairs. I believe, gentlemen, that there are circumstances in which ignorance—absence of technical knowledge, that is—has its uses and advantages, no less than eru-dition. It enables a man to approach highly compli-cated questions with frankness, without prejudice, with a seeing and a learning eye. It gives him a kind of simple daring which is sometimes seriously helpful. Yes, I really think that the simplicity of the thoroughly inexpert point of view, providing there is honest good intent behind it, may have its value. Now, when our Chairman thinks of the Citizen's

honest good intent behind it, may have its value. Now, when our Chairman thinks of the Citizen's Duty in Defence—and we all know that he has thought over that question to some real purpose—I conceive of his being faced at once by a baffling ar-tay of highly technical complications, with the tire-some weight and inherent antagonism of which his high position and long studies have made him only too familiar. And that is, of course, inevitable, and even desirable, where our leaders and experts are con-cerned. But, gentlemen, in the aims which I believe this Association has at heart you are concerned really with my party—with the outsiders, the general public, with the people who, in the mass, are the citizens of Britain. It is useful, then, to consider how this ques-tion of the Citizen's Duty in Defence strikes the inex-pert eye. Well, then, when outside people, like my-self, look at this question content of the strike my-

w to answer that question.

y poor way.

present

able of carrying arms." That is an admirable senti-ment—(hear, hear)—and I am sure it is gratifying to us all to know that the head of our present adminis-tratian should have given expression to it no longer ago than in the year 1900. But what is the quite average citizen going to do about it? How does he understand the statement?—seven-tenths of him, of course, never heard of it. I think he would under-stand it in this way: That if an invading army land-ed in this country he would be erpected to take his part in repelling it. And, in the innocence of his heart, he thinks: "Why, certainly! Of course I should!" He does not realize that the best of him would be of less use than a drummer boy; that in the should." He does not realize that the best of him would be of less use than a drummer boy; that in the mass he could offer no more resistance than a flock of sheep; that his very existence would vastly em-barrass the tiny army of educated fighters who would be saddled with his protection—from the enemy, and from the horrors of national panic.

But you might say, it is open to him to learn sol-diering by entering the army, or, if he does not want to do that, he can join the auxiliary forces. It is open to him-he may join! Gentlemen, believe me, such abstract facts as these have very little bearing upon the average British subject's conception of his duty as a man and a citizen. as a man and a citizen. I have said that his notion of duty is paying his way and obeying the laws of his country. And a very good notion, too, providing that the laws are comprehensive enough to cover his whole duty. If they are not, then I submit that the laws are at fault at fault.

There are at least twenty millions of people in these islands who have to concentrate their energies these islands who have to concentrate their energies pretty closely upon the task of earning something un-der thirty shillings a week, and I put it to you that it would not be reasonable to expect these people to search out new ways of performing the whole duty of citizenship outside the methods laid down by our laws and constitution. I would say further that it is vain to expect the same thing even from the more prosto expect the same thing even from the more pros-perous classes; vain, because, reasonable or not, the expectation is not justified by fact.

expectation is not justified by fact. Recent history, and the experience of themselves and their fathers—that is what the views of our peo-ple regarding their duty are based upon. And what does that teach in the matter of Defence? I am speaking now of the great majority of the populace, which includes the classes from which the rank and file of our recruits are drawn. It teaches that if a man is young, adventurously inclined, and without any sort of opening in life, it is open to him to enlist. If he is not young, quite young, soldiering is not only not expected of him, but it is forbidden him. If any-thing more profitable offers, as it generally does, he may quite honorably dismiss soldiering finally from may quite honorably dismiss soldiering finally does, he may quite honorably dismiss soldiering finally from his mind and enter another walk of life, with the full approval of all his pastors and masters—if he cares for that—and with the example before him of the most honorable and successful representatives of every other section of the community. I think that is a fair statement of fact.

is a fair statement of fact. If he has leisure, and some pocket-money to spare, and is interested in that kind of thing, he can take to volunteering; but no human creature he ever met will make any sort of comment if he prefers hop-scotch— whatever that may be—or billiards. And he may be pardoned if he adds to this the conclusion that, if he wants really to win all-round approval and respect pardoned if he adds to this the conclusion that, if he wants really to win all-round approval and respect— to achieve success, in fact—he had better leave all such trifling severely alone, and devote his leisure to the mastery of that sort of knowledge which enables a man to "better himself." That way lies far more of kudos and of material prosperity than are likely to come of rifle-shooting. come of rifle-shooting.

But, it might be said, there have been innumerable public utterances on the subject; the people have been told their duty often enough. In parenthesis, gentlemen, I would just like to point out that quite eight out of ten of the public utterances I have heard on the subject of the Citizen's Duty in Defence have included some remark to the effect that any sugges-tion of compulsory military service is repugnant to included some remark to the effect that any sugges-tion of compulsory military service is repugnant to the feelings of a freeborn people like the British; that nothing of the sort is possible in a country where the sentiment of individual freedom is as highly develop-ed as here. In short, gentlemen, that Britons never, never will be slaves! and that we, thank Heaven! are not as other peoples, in that we can pay men to do our fighting for us, and that Britons would never dream of accepting the slavish system under which every man is obliged to take his turn at soldiering. But in any case, gentlemen, public utterances do

But in any case, gentlemen, public utterances do But in any case, gentlemen, public utterances do not amount to very much where the man in the street and his sense of duty are concerned. Neither, to judge from the present accounts of shortage of army officers, and the like, do they count for very much with—shall we say, for distinction's sake —the man in the house. I don't mean St. Stephen's, of course; though even there I cannot think that public and of-ficial utterances regarding the citizen's duty in De-fence have counted for so much as they should, or surely parliment would have spoken plainly about it plainly about it through the one mouthpiece which the average Britisher has never neglected or ignored-the Statute Book. No, gentlemen, speaking for the average man in the street, I must submit that the Duty of the Citizen in Defence has never been placed clearly and unmisin Defence has never been placed clearly and unmis-takably before him—as duty. Remember that the public utterances (so many of which still insist upon the whole thing being quite a matter of personal taste and by no means obligatory) never reach the great majority, the small wage-earners. And if they did, among a multitude of directions, which is your aver-age man to choose? He has no knowledge of military tion of the Citizen's Duty in Defence strikes the inex-pert eye. Well, then, when outside people, like my-self, look at this question—and many of us I assure you are looking at it pretty hard and straightly—we do not, of course, see the mass of conflicting detail which faces the expert. And that is, perhaps, just as well for us. Further, we cannot weigh the technical pros and cons with the practical judgment of soldiers, because our modern life and education has taught us nothing whatever about soldiering. And so we see the bare question itself, without any of its side issues: What is the Citizen's Duty in Defence? I submit, gentlemen, that the quite average British citizen anong a matriculate of directions, which is your aver-age man to choose? He has no knowledge of military science or of modern military conditions, has never had a gun in his hand, and does not know whether it takes a day, or a month, or a year to learn its use, nor what precise value may be attached to its use when acquired. Remember that he was born and ntlemen, that the quite average British citizen-e man in the street, as the saying is-does not know reared in an atmosphere of commercial activity and peace, and that life in England has taught him nothing whatever regarding discipline or self-defence. Modern life in England does not teach these things how to answer that question. Our British public has always been slow to as-similate ideas, principles, theories, and the like. Cus-tom is of slow growth with us; and, having grown, it is tenacious of life and hard to destroy or alter. The average plain Englishman's notion of his duty as a citizen is that he should pay his way and obey the have of his country. He does not see very far beyond that; but so far, I think it fair to say, he is as good a citizen as any other in the world. But this, you hight say, does not touch the question of Defence. What about the citizen's conceptions of his duty there? Gentlemen, he hasn't any. Broadly speaking, and referring to the average man, he has not got any, to the average man. All he knows of fighting is that it leads to appearances in police courts and conseient fines or imprisonment. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Which course would you suggest should appeal to him as that of his Citizen's Duty in Defence? To en-ter the army? There is no need for me to remind you that during the past couple of years he has seen that army reduced by thousands—by 30,000 or 40,000, perhaps. And, in any case, it has never been, sug-gested to him that this is his duty; but rather that, like emigration, it is one of his last resources, when I referring to the average man, he has not got any, nd a vague notion that governments are not what used to be, and that he, the citizen, is paying ugh the nose in the matter of taxation, yet his Which of them, and how, and why? unless his inclin-ations and circumstances happen to lead him in this direction? There is nothing to show him that actual duty points this way, as there is to show fathers the duty of making their children learn to read and try's defences seem from all accounts to be in a e late Lord Salisbury said, "The defence of the ountry is not the business of the war office or the overnment, but the business of the people themwrite. Further, gentlemen, I want you please to bear in mind that there is much which points in the opves." (Hear, hear.) To my thinking that was a foundly true remark; but I ask you, gentlemen, at chance the British public in the mass have ever of assimilating that truth and acting upon it? posite direction-away from voluntary military train-Tom and Dick are clerical underlings in a newspaper office, let us say. Tom devotes his leisure the study of shorthand and public meetings. D of assimilating that truth and acting upon it? one who knows our people, or human nature gen-y for that matter, would suggest that the late i Salisbury's statement of the truth was sufficient. aware, of course, that we have had eloquent and istent claborations of it from patriots like Lord erts I suspect that every member of this associ-n believes the statement, and promulgates it gives his to volunteering. Tom presently gets a repor-tership, and double pay, and a rise in the social scale, Dick tership, and double pay, and a rise in the social scale, while Dick remains a clerical underling. Dick may also become a good shot; but'that will not affect his income by one penny. Which course commends itself most to Mrs. Tom and Dick, and to their respective circles? Which man's regarded as the more success-ful, and therefore the more worthy of respect? Does any person venture to suggest that Tom is remiss in any way or has failed to do his duty as a citizen? On the contrary, his income grows steadily. like his re-Is associated by the statement, and promulgates it believes the statement, and promulgates it e he can. But if these were to be the only ods of bringing it right home to every man and in in these islands, of making them realize in own porsons the full meaning of it, then, gentle-ible we that not even the youngest man here ht whild see the end of that task. Nay, with all dity. I would venture to go very much farther. the contrary, his income grows steadily, like his re-pute, and he presently is able to subscribe to a fund by means of which Dick is helped to emigrate—cleriy, I would venture to go very much farther say that I believe the British empire would cal underlings, even when they are good shots, being eased to exist before the end was achieved. I of only one voice—only one, gentlemen, how-dent the others—which can carry definitely aualways a drug in the market. always a drug in the market. I have outlined an extreme case, you say. Cer-tainly; because I wanted it to strike you. But, gen-tlemen, it is a perfectly possible case; and while it is a possible case I submit that the people of England in the mass can never be expected to realize that the in-dividual Citizen's Duty in Defence actually demands any further care on his part than the payment of taxes and the occasional cheering of a passing body perfections. the and permanent meaning to the great mu-we call the British public; and that is the voice sovereign, as interpreted by the sovereign's is and judges in the laws of the land. y of the defence of the sametic. "The pertry and homes ought to be the duty of every man car of soldiers.

Supposing that the question could be put to every able-bodied man in the kingdom: What is the citi-zen's first duty in life? the answer in at least eight Leases out of ten, I venture to say, would be: To pay his way and respect the law. But then, you ask, what about his duty as protector of his home and women and children? Gentlemen, in accordance with his education, his personal experience, and the tradi-tions of his life during the past three generations, the citizen's reply would be that paying his way includes all that, and is essential to it. The only enemy he knows is want; and that is an enemy known to only knows is want; and that is an enemy known to only too many of our people. When he thinks of the pro-tection of his home and women and children he means their protection from want, from starvation and the balliffs, or from discomfort and shortness of cash, according to his position in life.

cash, according to his position in life. And please remember, gentlemen, that this is a sufficiently serious problem for the vast majority; and that that vast majority consists of the very peo-ple who have had least opportunity of realizing the nature of other and broader aspects of the citizen's duty. But, in my opinion, the majority in all classes are alike, from the highest to the lowest, in suppos-ing that naving one's way and respecting the laws is ing that paying one's way and respecting the laws is the whole duty of citizenship, and that the taking of any other more direct share in the work of national defence is purely and simply a matter of personal in-clination and taste-not at all one of duty, and honor, and obligation.

When the mature citizen asks the youngster, "what are you going to do?" and the youngster says he is going to be a lawyer, or a doctor, or a butcher, or a candlestick-maker, the mature citizen does not think of adding, "Yes, but what are you going in for in the military line? What kind of military training shall you take?" And, gentlemen, in existing circumstances, what is there to make the asking of such a question natural? What bearing has it upon the workaday life of the quite average British citizen? He knows that he can look round upon the bulk of his associates, and pastors and masters, his leaders and employers, his heroes and his legislators, and say of them that they know nothing of any military training. He knows that though, when he applies for certain posts, he may be asked where he went to school, and what he has learned of this, that, and the other, he will never, nev-er be asked what is his average score at the rifle butts going to be a lawyer, or a doctor, or a butcher, or er be asked what is his average score at the rifle butts or what drilling course he has been through.

I once said something of this sort to a member of the British House of Commons who had just finished addressing an election meeting. His comment was something to this effect:

"But the facts are against you. A large number of citizens do recognize our needs in this matter. How else do you account for the Army we have and the Auxiliary Forces ?"

I wish the question could have been put to some member of this Association rather than to an ignor-amus like myself. I had no figures, such as you would have used, to overwhelm my politician. I could not give him statistics showing the iron necessity under which the physical strength? give him statistics showing the iron necessity under which the physical standard for recruits has had to be lowered year by year till it embraces not alone boys, but boys who are very distinctly below the average in physique. Neither had I any figures about the shortage of officers, or the generally admitted insuf-ficiency and inefficiency of our present military forces. I was not even able to tell him, what is known to everyone here tonight, I believe, that, while the area of the British Empire has increased more than ten-fold during the past century, and its population by

everyone here tonight, I believe, that, while the area of the British Empire has increased more than ten-fold during the past century, and its population by skteen-fold, and its commerce by about eighteen-fold, yet our total effective fighting forces number less by fully fifty thousand—I believe it is now nearer a hundred thousand—than they did in the year 1805. I did not even think to point out how monstrously such a decrease as this is accentuated by the far more than corresponding increase in the armed strength of our competitors in the world. But what I did say was that I accounted our present military forces not at all as evidence of the nation's recogni-tion and acceptance of the Clitizen's Duty in Defence, but as due to three distinct causes. First, the exis-tence among us of a certain number of men to whom enlisting appealed as a refuge from starvation, as a last desperate resource. Second, to the existence among us of a certain number of men and half-grown lads in whom the spirit of adventure and the love of arms for arms sake was not dead, and to whom, therefore, military service appealed as the one means of gratifying an instinct and an inclination— not a sense of duty. And, thirdly, to the existence among us of a certain small leaven of men and halfnot a sense of duty. And, thirdly, to the existence among us of a certain small leaven of men and lads, in all ranks of life, who from family counsel and tradi-tion, or from personal strength of character, did ac-tually recognize and obey a sense of duty which di-rected them to learn to take a real part in the defence of their native land. of their native land.

While paying all possible honor to the members of this third section, and welcoming the spirit of those of the second section, I claimed that it was absurd to suggest that these prove the nation's recognition and acceptance of the Citizen's whole Duty in Defence, and that only cowardice on the nation's part could explain the continued sheltering of all the rest of us behind conditions in which the whole burden of activ participation in our defence was left to these three comparatively small sections of our manhood: those who could find no other means of getting food, those who were in quest of adventure, and the sturdy but lamentably small minority who "Saw their duty a dead-sure thing, and went for it then and thar!" Well, gentlemen, it falls to be confessed that, owing to my ignorance of detail, of the technical aspects ing to my ignorance of detail, of the technical aspects of the whole great question, that member of parlia-ment very soon had me bushed, as they say in Aus-tralia, and floundering about out of my depth in a sea of figures and political phrases, so that I retreatsea of ligures and political phrases, so that I retreat-ed from the fray in some confusion. I did not have a gathering of the National Defence Association be-hind me, you see. I wish I had had, for I am sure that most of you would have been able to achieve more than I did in the way of unsettling the profound com-placency of my Member's satisfaction with existing conditions of Citizenship and Defence. But I hold that the ware completence of that and But I hold that the mere complaisance of that one But I hold that the mere complaisance of that one man—an educated gentleman and a chosen represen-tative of the people in parliament—was and is of it-self a proof of the justice of my contention, that the great bulk of our people, the average men and women who make up the nation, have no real understanding whatever of the actual Duty of the Citizen with re-gard to Defence. They never will have until it's auwhatever of the actual Duty of the Citizen with re-gard to Defence. They never will have until it is au-thoritatively and formally defined for them with the same clearness that our duty is defined for us in other matters, such as education, vaccination, sanitation, ratepaying, and other fundamentals of citizenship. There are certain rudimentary duties of life which we are taught by force of circumstances and by the traditions of our civilization, as, for example. the we are taught by force of circumstances and by the traditions of our civilization, as, for example, the primary and generally admitted duty of paying our way and making provision for those dependent upon us. Some men need forcing even to this; but there is no room for doubt about it; it is absolutely clear to us—a very definite responsibility. Consequently, only wastrels and criminals neglect it; and of them the law takes account so far as it can. One may not ize law takes account, so far as it can. One may not ig-nore this fundamental duty and remain respectable. One can quite easily ignore the Citizen's Duty in Defence and remain respectable, perfectly normal, and quite unchallenged. And, accordingly, for so human nature is constituted, one does neglect it—I speak of nature is constituted, one does neglect it—I speak of the great majority. One does neglect it, and, in exist-ing circumstances, one is not in any sense blamed. It is just a matter of personal inclination. And it is not by any means clear what course the man should adopt who has glimmerings of dis-satisfaction with this state of things. There is no definitely understood track for him to follow, though there may be half a dozen possible ones. The sad thing is that if he takes any one of them he is con-scious, not simply of sharing the common lot of citizens and taking his just share in the responsi-bilities of his race, but, on the contrary, of saddling bilities of his race, but, on the contrary, of saddling himself gratuitously with distinct penalties which attach to the work of stepping aside from the com-mon highway. He is penalized for having a more acute sense of national duty than his fellows, and in the race with his fellow-citizens for livelihood and for success he is handicapped by what many of them regard as a quixotic and rather cranky view of his responsibilities. nsibilities Naturally, this is very far from being the view of him which would be taken by a member of such a body as the National Defence Association. But you will remember that I am speaking as an outsider of outsiders, of the quite average members of our public. There are thousands of men who fought for us in South Africa, and who, as a consequence, have never regained their footing in the fierce race which is what life means to millions of our fellow-subjects. It is with the utmost deliberation, and, I believe, with simple truth, that I would say of the flower of our young manhood in England today that, even if the duty of undergoing adequate military training were generally recognized—which it is not —it would still be impossible of attainment without grave loss, and risk of loss, and all-round handi-The would still be impossible of attainment without grave loss, and risk of loss, and all-round handi-capping in the business of life, as understood by those who have to earn their own living. I am not able to back such a statement with satistics, but I believe, gentlemen, that it is based upon common knowledge and correct observation, and I do not think it will be disputed by anyone who has tested it.

And this, gentlemen, is where I think we are And this, gentlemen, is where i think we are radically at fault. It is the moral and human aspect of the whole thing which appeals to me so strongly. Looking at it as one who has everything to learn and nothing but his own personal conviction to back him I can see neither common justice nor common him, I can see neither common justice nor common sense in our present National Defence. Gentlemen, at the risk of displeasing you, I must go farther, and say that if, as I was told today, the National Deand say that if, as I was told today, the National De-fence Association aims at no more than the spread of military training among those who choose it, and care for it, then, with all deference, I cannot think that the Association's aim goes far enough for com-plete justice. That is how it seems to me. I can-not see how, with justice, we can saddle the willing horses alone with what is admittedly the positive duty of all. The whole team must share it fairly.

With regard to the practical efficiency and ade-quacy of our present system, I prefer to go to ex-perts for my opinions rather than to trust to my own technically ill-equipped powers of observation or reason. As a taxpayer I have contributed my mite-towards the costly mechanism which has produced our experts, and given them both knowledge and authority. It would be absurd for me to quote to members of this Association the opimions of our senior Field-Marshals, of our Chairmah of this evening, of our leading generals, of the Royal Com-mission on the War, or of the Royal Commission on the Auxiliary Forces. They are all known to you, and they all, as I understand them, prohibit the pos-sibility of regarding our existing military defences as adequate. With regard to the practical efficiency and adeas adequate.

With regard, then, to the aspect in estimating which every man must use his own judgment—the moral aspect of this question of National Defence— I find myself in complete harmony with the publicly expressed view of most of our leaders and authorexpressed view of most of our leaders and author-ities. Take, for example, two—the present Prime Minister and the gentlemen responsible for the Re-port of the Commission on the Auxiliary Forces. It seems to me wise to quote, even a second time, the port of the Commission on the Auxiliary Forces. It seems to me wise to quote, even a second time, the head of our present Administration. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman stated in the House of Com-mons that "the personal duty of the defence of the sanctity of our country and homes ought to be the duty of every man capable of bearing arms." The Commission on the Auxiliary Forces reported that "It is the duty of every citizen of military age and sound physique to be trained for the national de-fence." The Report, you will note, said "every citi-zen." The Prime Minister said "every man." The law, custom, recent tradition, public opinion, and an astonishingly large majority of public men, when questioned in the presence of voters, all alike com-bine to misinterpret these statements in communi-cating them to the average citizen." and in place of "every man" and "every citizen" to say, in effect, "every truly patriotic man," or "every really con-scientious citizen," or, in other words, "everybody who is inclined that way and whose dreumstances make the undergoing of such training convenient." That, gentlemen, is my quarrel with the Citizen's Duty in Defence as it is understood and as it is placed before us by those set in authority. I sub-mit that it is consistently misinterpreted and mis-represented by the whole weight of public and legislative authority and tradition before it reaches the man most concerned—the average citizen. In this, it seems to me, our leaders and teachers are very gravely at fault; and those of them who seem to me most culpably to blame are the gentlemen of this, it seems to me, our leaders and teachers are very gravely at fault; and those of them who seem to me most culpably to blame are the gentlemen of high public standing who continue to seek an inex-pensive kind of popularity by asserting in season and out of season—if such statements can ever be in season—that for a people so highly educated in free-form and liberty of conscience as ourselves com-pulsory military training or service must ever be ab-horrent and impracticable. Such statements are amply sufficient to stultify and make void in the public view the Royal Commission's verdict regard-ing the duty of "every citizen" and the Prime Minis-ter's just estimate of the "personal duty of every ter's just estimate of the "personal duty of every man." Surely there can be nothing abhorrent to a free people in legislative definition and regularizaman." Surviy there can be nothing about the to a free people in legislative definition and regulariza-tion of that which is admittedly the duty, not of those who like it, but of "every man." But our peo-ple are consistently encouraged to regard it as ab-horrent. Upon what grounds? Well, I have been at some pains to discover those Well, I have been at some pains to discover those grounds, and have sought information from a large variety of people. I have found two main reasons set forth as justifying England in declining to fall into line with other countries in this respect. One is that compulsory military training would foster the dangerous spirit of militarism; the other is that the people of England have been educated to a higher standard of freedom than the people of the continental nations, and that, therefore, they would never submit to the slavish condition of compulsion never submit to the slavish condition of compulsion in this matter. I do not know what exact measure of the danger-military training; but whatever it may be, it has been enjoined upon us as part and parcel of the duty not of a sort of forlorn band of the spiritually damed, but of "every citizen." As a matter of fact, I can see glimmerings—just glimmerings—of logic in the point of view of the humanitarian who, believing warfare to be wicked, draws the line at soldiering and military training; while these are the preserve of the few, the profession chosen freely and de-liberately by a minority. But I could not discern even the faintest glimmering of logic in such an at-titude if it bore upon the common lot of every man among us, of every citizen. I do not know what exact measure of the danger-Then, with regard to the matter of our exalted sense of freedom, as compared with the slavishness of other folk, I would like to point out that most of of other folk, I would like to point out that most of the continental nations enjoy representative gov-ernment just as we do. That is to say, the people of those countries make their own laws just as we do. The only difference that I can see is that while we admit that it is the duty of every citizen to fit himself to play a practical part in the defence of his country—and leave it at that, save for a few in-direct contradictions in the matter of assertions re-garding our abhorence of compulsion—the people of these other countries make the same statement and, as a matter of course, act upon it. And it does seem to me that unless and until we know how to be at least as honest and conscientious in our vaunt-ed freedom as our continental neighbors, in their self-made and voluntarily adhered-to slavery we self-made and voluntarily adhered-to slavery,, we do ill to put forward our higher national standard as do in to put forward our higher national standard as a reason against legislating to provide universal military training. We do ill to boast of the fact that we prefer to leave our defence to those who have no choice but to accept our pay for doing it, and to no choice but to accept our pay for doing it, and to the few conscientiously patriotic ones among us who voluntarily take up a burden which should be our common lot. A volunteer is said to be worth ten pressed men. A large proportion of our army is im-pressed—by poverty. The armies of our neighbors consist of nations voluntarily trained to arms by laws of their own making. It would be foolish for me to attempt to speak to such a company as this regarding the practical It would be foolish for me to attempt to speak to such a company as this regarding the practical effect upon our military strength of a condition which would ensure the recognition by every one of the Citizen's Duty in Defence. The members of this Association are, doubtless, far better informed upon such a military point than I can be. We have all read the verdicts of the authorities upon our exist-ing defences, and, I may add (with special reference to Sir George Taubman Goldie's Memorandum to the Report of the War Commission), upon the grave dangers attaching to our lack of any system of national military education. I make no attempt, therefore, to deal with the military aspect of the

question, but I do wish to say, gentlemen, with regard to its national and moral aspect, that I can conceive of no higher aim, no more truly patriotic purpose for such a body as the National Defence Association than that of honestly placing before the British pub-lic once and for all the real meaning of that per-sistently misrepresented phrase, the Duty of the Citizen in Defence, and demonstrating politically and in all other ways the fact that this responsi-bility concerns not this class or the other class, but every single citizen among us.

every single citizen among us. It is fair to say, I think, that our legislators, and such influential bodies as this Association, have in such influential bodies as this Association, neve in this matter a heavy responsibility upon their shoul-ders. And in this I think some good may be done by insisting upon a definite facing of the question by candidates for parliament, and, it might be, by actually providing candidates pledged to serve reform. It is a matter in which a people must not be ex-pected to act of their own volition, save under pres-sure of instant peril or dire catastrophe. I think we sure of instant peril or dire catastrophe. I think we have a right to expect that our leaders should truly lead in this matter, rather than follow with one eye on the gallery and the voting barometer. Common prudence demands that the leaders should take defin-ite action, without waiting till peril or panic shall cause the people to "turn and rend the jawers and takers who prevent us from being prepared to meet invasion." You may guess that I am quoting, or I should not venture upon so emphatic a form. The words are those of one whose authority in military matters is not lightly to be set aside—Field-Marshal Lord Wolseley.

In this matter of legislation which should give us a system of national military training, and so enable every man among us to perform what is stated to be the duty of every single citizen. I believe, for example, that if the present Prime Minister, whose view as to the duty of every man in national de-fence I have quoted to you, were to introduce a measure for the provision of imperial and obligatory military training in Britain, the great and powerful majority he represents in parlia-ment would be overthrown. Indeed, gentle-men, I find it hard to believe that if the Pre-sents in parliament would be overthrwno. Indeed, gentlemen, I find it hard to believe that if the Pre-mier sought to give legislative reality to his ex-In this matter of legislation which should give

gentlemen, I find it hard to believe that if the Pre-mier sought to give legislative reality to his ex-pressed view of our national duty in this all-import-ant matter, he would find one single voice raised against him from the opposition side of the House. There is a little country in Europe where, as you know, the directest possible method is in use for ob-taining the people's verdict upon legislative meas-ures. In that country—Switzerland—the percentage of soldiers—of soldiers actually trained and ready to take the field—to all males of military age in the whole populace is no less than 67 per cent. You are doubtless aware that in Great Britain it is under 11 per cent.

But, gentlemen, as I see these things, it is under But, gentlemen, as I see these things, it is not alone even upon national grounds, it is also upon moral and social grounds, and as a matter of simple justice, that I would urge the absolute need of mak-ing the Citizen's Duty in Defence applicable to every citizen, understood by every citizen, and as obliga-tory upon him as his duty in sending his children to school his duty in providing them with a more to school, his duty in providing them with a roof (as well as protecting it), or his duty in paying his rates and serving on juries. It is a measure of justice, humanity, and social progress that the thing appeals to me quite as forcibly as in the interests of National Defence

What, gentlemen, is the greatest need of our time What, gentiemen, is the greatest need of our time and people? Believe me, it is simply the sense of duty, simply discipline—the old, simple respect for and devotion to duty which made Nelson's death more glorious even than his glorious life. The ninetreath century brought to us of the British stock great wealth, great power, and marvellous material prosperity. I do profoundly believe that if the early part of the twentieth century fails to bring to us some revival of the simple, rudimentary virtues with which, in our race for material gain, we have lost touch, that our face for material gain, we have lost touch, that our children, or their children, will know the bitterness of losing all the great wealth and pride of place that we inherited, in trust for them. If so, the fault would lie rather with us than with them, and history would brand the record of our particular time with a wedict that would or all of our particular me with a verdict that would spell cowardice and treachery.

I do not think that there is a single person in this room who would contradict me if I said that military training for purposes of national defence forms one of the most valuable methods known to humanity of communicating discipline and strengthening the indi-vidual sense of duty. What is it but complete absence of any knowledge of discipline or sense of duty that fills some of our city streets with a rapidly increasing race of utter wastrels, poor obscene caricatures of manhood, whom the police know as "public-house props," men who live from year to year without ever doing a day's work; furtive, fawning parasites, who



indifference all

annot be recon-

hals will exhibit

but some parti-

wardice, or fear

be understood,

accountable, in-

to some injury it on a former

will not toler-

n circumstances.

the same under

may be practi-

ar when stand-

come verv un-

others are inout will not go Again, some be-

hard to handle

nem, but pay no ting one, while

may be claimed ders on bridles,

the same pecuen bridles. The

ist in regard to

annot be satis-

consider mat-

rprised that we

ertainly is cruel

d. If we consi-

nind many wo-

become greatly m. They can-

some cases be-

on having the

ted, etc. They y. They know

ipany and arti-

ut all the same us, then, be

orses the same ts in some hu-

rguments go to

is engendered

nments than by perates to some

nly is wise to known courage

intensify such ke sure of their

ghts and noises

before we can drive or ride

e to act badly

or other condi-

fe for general

an experienced e would again

it education is ed; and that

and unsafe by

petent drivers.

WINER

ary 31, 1908.

to determine c may be made e, if the needle Dip the needle hdraw it in an ontains only a ll prevent even needle. casion to heat be scorched.

ng to do is to n the fire and . Put a pinch It will then be urnt taste has red.

nt cleaner for e should be er then be al-. Then polish

on most farms nd never pays busy kind can't hem up before

e a good dust ed to lay well ply of earth or the season and coal ashes can

on pasture the nsitive to flies. a cool stable The time to the first two

for the horse fully dried be-Shavings and ut hay, straw se they have

ng a day's work; furtive, fawning parasites, who prey even upon fallen women?

One of the forces at the root of the great wave of unrest and discontent which is labelled Socialism, of which we hear so much, is unguestionably just lack of discipline, utter absence of the self-controlling in-fluence of discipline, superimposed upon what we call education. Why, gentlemen, education itself is no better than a venomous and self-destructive force failing the wise and balancing control of discipline and the sense of duty. Yet we have long since decid-ed that we owed it to posterity to make education compulsory—compulsory, gentlemen; not merely open to our people, but their bounden duty. But military training for national defence—the finest, richest source of discipline—that is still a matter of chance source of alke with the educated and the half-educated. Surely the existence of compulsory schooling along-side of merely voluntary military training, or schooling in the discipline of citizenship, is a clear and lamentable case of the cart being placed before the horse. We hear the question asked, How best may we fight Socialism? Gentlemen, the fighting of a symptom is mere quackery. If we admit, as I fancy all here do admit, that mil-

itary training for purposes of National Defence is cal-culated to endow a young man with a sense of duty, of discipline, and of patriotism; if we admit, as I fancy of discipline, and of patriotism; if we admit, as l fancy we all do, that it is calculated to benefit the bodies of our people as surely as their minds and characters —why, then, gentlemen, putting aside altogether for expert consideration the matter of our military needs, I cannot see how we can possibly be justified in with-holding military training from the nation. And-let us not blink the facts—any sort of training which is not compulsory is actually withheld from one very large section of the community—the poor; while it most certainly will not be made use of by the ma-jority of another large and important class. That is axiomatic, I think. Experience has proved it. Many thousands of well-to-do people with a wide choice of occupation will never avail themselves of voluntary military training. Many millions of needy

voluntary military training. Many millions of needy people, on the other hand, with little or no choice of upation and no leisure, will never avail themselves of voluntary training. There remains a sturdy, brave, honorable, conscientious, and well-advised minority who will avail themselves of the opportunity of unwho will avail themselyes of the opportunity of un-dergoing such training in order to fit themselves for the defence of their country. Please note, gentlemen, that this minority necessarily consists in a large measure of those least in need of all that military training has to teach; those least in need of discip-line, those least in need of being awakened to a sense of duty. And those of the more conscientiously patri-otic kind, these are penalized under any voluntary system—Mr. Haldane's or any other—for the ignor-ance and absence of active patriotism in all their fel-low-citizens. Upon their shoulders the whole burden of defence is laid. They perforce spare with the rest of us the dangers of unpreparedness and want of military training and discipline. And in return for their spotaneous patriotism they will learn that while they give their time and energies to military training their less conscientious competitors in the race after material prosperity have left them behind at the aterial prosperity have left them behind at the starting-place.

starting-place. I have hunted for information upon this point among all classes, from the curious folk who speak of "the hellish art of shooting"—I am quoting—to those who plead, rightly, as I think, for a nation in arms as the one true method of defence. But, human nature and the stress of modern competition being what they are, I cannot for the life of me see how the mind of