

I confess the old bugbear "expense" stares you in the face again here, but once more may I ask; is our force to be a reality or a sham?

If it is a reality, is it not the one point at which we are aiming, to teach men to shoot what they are aiming at? If, therefore, we leave out the training for the one great essential, what is the use of all the rest?

Prince Kraft Hohenlohe, in his work upon artillery, lays down *three great principles*. The first is to HIT, the second to HIT, and the third to HIT.

Are not those the three great principles we should also aim at? If so, what is the use of all the other expenditure if we neglect this?

These remarks apply equally to city corps. When they get what I hope to see them with, viz., a true volunteer organization with a capitation grant, they will have to earn that grant by putting in a percentage of drills and firing so many rounds of ammunition. This number will be at least 100, I hope, and the same rule for firing by word of command applied.

The city corps are our first line of defence, and we should spare no pains or expense to bring them into a thoroughly efficient state. Of course, in this matter of rifle shooting qualification, our old ghost *expense* appears. To begin with, ammunition costs something. Then, again, if you *oblige* men to do so much firing, you are *obliged* to transport them to the range. If the range is 10 or 20 miles out from their headquarters you cannot oblige them to pay their own fare out there, you must carry them *free*. This is a point which I happen to know was urged upon the authorities when the Toronto Rifle Ranges were given up to the city, and the city should have been compelled to give *free* transport to the new ranges. It is too late now, however, and the country must face the music in Toronto, Montreal and elsewhere, wherever the ranges are beyond walking distance.

The obligatory firing of every man in the ranks is one great good, I hope to see come out of a legal volunteer organization for our city corps.

I have heard only one objection to such a change in their constitution, and that is to the name Volunteer instead of Militia. I heard a Canadian born and bred say that in England they think more of the militia than of the volunteers, and for that reason he objected to the change of name. That will be news to most old countrymen in these times. But, seriously, should such an objection prevent so necessary a reform from being carried out?