This article was downloaded by: [University of Toronto Libraries]

On: 26 December 2014, At: 00:06

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered

Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41

Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Royal United Services Institution. Journal

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rusi19>

I. The Ranks Compared with Civilian Workingclass Life.—II. Recruiting Difficulties.—III. The Condition of the Army Reserve

Colonel F. J. Graves

Published online: 11 Sep 2009.

To cite this article: Colonel F. J. Graves (1891) I. The Ranks Compared with Civilian Workingclass Life.—II. Recruiting Difficulties.—III. The Condition of the Army Reserve, Royal United Services Institution. Journal, 35:160, 573-601, DOI: [10.1080/03071849109416567](https://doi.org/10.1080/03071849109416567)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03071849109416567>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

The Journal

OF THE

Royal United Service Institution.

VOL. XXXV.

JUNE, 1891.

No. 160.

[Monthly Issue.]

Friday, April 17, 1891.

GENERAL SIR ARTHUR J. HERBERT, K.C.B., in the Chair.

I. THE RANKS COMPARED WITH CIVILIAN WORKING-CLASS LIFE.—II. RECRUITING DIFFICULTIES.—III. THE CONDITION OF THE ARMY RESERVE.¹

By Colonel F. J. GRAVES, 20th Hussars.

I.

IN May last year I read a paper here on "Cavalry Equipment, Organization, and Distribution," in which I touched upon the Reserve question, and at the close of the discussion several of the Council asked me to prepare a paper on the basis of my remarks, and to include the subject of Recruiting.

The subject comprised in the three heads of my paper to-day has, during the past year, occupied the public mind to an extraordinary extent; the principal papers have had leading articles, and many magazines have had contributions from able pens and influential sources: this theatre and the lecture room of the Aldershot Military Society have been the arenas of animated and useful discussions on no less useful lectures delivered by Officers who have studied the subject. So much has been said and written on this important subject, that I hesitated long before deciding to appear before you to-day, but I do so for two reasons: first, because I think a great deal of uncalled-for "stale fish" has been cried concerning our soldiers and the general conditions of life in the ranks; secondly, because, for the purpose of comparison between these conditions and those obtaining in the ranks of the wage-earning population, I have had opportunities of study and of gaining information that seldom fall to the lot

¹ The publication of this lecture has been unavoidably delayed.—Ed.
VOL. XXXV. 2 R

of an Officer on full pay. There is scarcely a staple trade of our country the conditions and circumstances of which I have not studied, and with the wage-earning workers of which I have not mixed. My opportunities have been as varied as the classes with which I have come in contact, from the huge mass meeting of thousands of artisans at a Church Congress to a dozen or more in the common room of a tramps' and thieves' lodging in a filthy slum.

With regard to the soldier of the present day, it is said that he compares unfavourably with those of days gone by. I am bound to admit that great numbers of our recruits are too young, and that at certain periods of pressing need many are enlisted that do not fulfil the conditions and physical requirements of their calling. I admit that the present soldier compares unfavourably with the past chiefly in the matter, the important matter, of age. Colonel G. M. Onslow, no mean authority, thinks that the physique of the present is up to the standard of the past.

Compared with the recruits of Continental armies ours, even now, compare favourably. In Austria, France, Germany, and Russia the minimum age is 20 years; minimum height ranges from 5 feet 0½ inch to 5 feet 1½ inches; chest measurement from "no limit" to 30·8 inches. In this kingdom the limits are 18 years; 5 feet 4 inches height; and chest 33 inches. With us, the age in the ranks among men of first period runs from 18 to 25 years; in the above armies, not beyond 23 as a rule. The latter have the advantages of being, as a rule, better nourished and educated before joining. As to crime and drunkenness, there is less now than ever there was in our Army.

In education vast strides have been made. In matters of sanitation, except in one or two notorious instances, our men's conditions of life compare favourably with those of any of the civilian classes of unskilled labour, and with many of the skilled.

As to cleanliness, they compare favourably with any ordinary wage-earning class.

The result of above facts, as well as other causes not named, is, that in times of peace the rate of mortality among soldiers in this kingdom is lower than that of any ordinary working class, agriculturists possibly excepted.

The comparison with foreign armies is truly astonishing. The report of Dr. Corput, an official of the Belgian Government, states the death-rate for last year in the German Army as 3·97 per cent.; in French, 6; Belgian, 4·07; Austria, 6·94; in this kingdom, 0·86.

It should also be remembered, when comparing the present soldier with the past, that in times of need, such as 1812 and 1858, the minimum height with us was 5 feet 3 inches, and in 1859 the chest limit went down to 33 inches. Further, that in one period of six years under the old system, *i.e.*, ending 1865, an average of 5,000 men per annum were discharged to modified pension as unfit for further service, the majority of whom had less than six years' service, and that during the same period the average annual "wanting to complete" establishment was 4,500.

So much for the recruit as he is. Let us examine his position as a wage-earner compared with his civilian brother.

My endeavour will be to prove that, for a man of his age and inches and average intellectual qualifications, he is better off than almost any class of unskilled wage-earner in civil life, and further, that without the above reservation as to physique, &c., he on enlistment has better prospects in his calling of advancement than almost any civilian wage-earner, skilled or unskilled.

First, he receives in the cavalry clothing and underclothing valued at 12*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* free; then year by year he receives clothing, &c., valued at 4*l.* 0*s.* 8½*d.*

His weekly wage in money and in kind I consider is as follows:—

	Cavalry.			Infantry.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Money	0	8	2	0	7	0
Bread and meat	0	3	6	0	3	6
Clothing	0	1	6	0	1	0
Coal and light	0	2	4	0	2	4
Lodging	0	2	4	0	2	4
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	£0	17	10	0	16	2

To this must be added value of, or the interest on value of, furniture, bed, bedding, cleaning utensils, cooking utensils, tables, forms, shelves, fire-irons, coal boxes, cans, brushes, &c., the washing of his bedding, his rates, taxes, and water, and medical attendance, added to which he has the services of a comrade to cook his food, free. I think I am within the mark when I put the value of foregoing at at least another 1*s.* per week, bringing up the total to 18*s.* 10*d.* per week, or, including deferred pay, exactly 1*l.* in cavalry and 17*s.* 4*d.* in infantry.

On the other hand, the cavalry soldier has to pay out of his 21*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.* cash received annually for groceries, washing, hair cutting, repairs to clothing, &c., replacing necessaries, his share of barrack damages, library, &c., a sum which, when every necessary of life has been supplied him and paid for, leaves him 4*s.* to 5*s.* 6*d.* per week to spend on luxuries. I would ask what class of unskilled labourers have such a weekly balance to waste or save?

Further, he is assured of constant employment; no change of weather can rob him of his daily bread—no slackness of trade lowers his wage. Is this true of civil life? No! He is paid sick or well, on duty or on furlough; he travels single fare for the double journey, as also do his wife and children if he has such. He gets a higher rate of interest in his regimental savings-bank than his civilian brother can obtain, and has the use of canteen, coffee shop, and recreation accommodation of a useful if not high class; he has free education as well.

The foregoing are his present-tense privileges from the day he joins.

Before stating the conditions obtaining in several callings in civil life I would like to draw your special attention to one important fact in favour of the soldier as compared with the civilian. His sole qualifications for employment are his physique and his apparent mental capacity, his moral worth does not enter the question as a rule.

In choosing certain callings in civil life for the purposes of comparison, I have, with one exception, selected those which have occupied the public mind to a great degree recently. First, then, the economical status of the agricultural labourer has been the cause of considerable anxiety and discussion. The ordinary farm hand earns a weekly wage ranging from 7s. per week in Wiltshire, as General Dunne informed us the other day here, to 16s. in some more favoured districts. I believe the average is about 12s. 6d. per week, out of which he has to find shelter, food, clothing, fuel, and light, and all the necessaries of life for himself and, as often as not, for his wife and family.

He also subscribes, as a rule, to a sick club, and to a union. He must have a fairly good character before he is taken on. He must be able-bodied. His hours are long and his work is laborious. His employment is not constant. When sick his place is filled up, and, as a rule, he has no work in hard weather beyond occasional "odd jobs." In his case, then, meat is not an article of daily consumption, and is almost a luxury. Further, he has to pay for the education of his children.

The proof that life, or existence, under the foregoing conditions is considered hard, and that the occupation is thought unprofitable, lies in the fact that great and increasing numbers of the agricultural population have been and are migrating to the cities and towns in the hope, too often vain, of bettering themselves. I do not think it requires any argument to show that the soldier is better off than "Hodge."

The Scotch railway strikes which caused so much anxiety and inconvenience to the public, as well as misery and want to the strikers, led me to inquire into the conditions of life among railway porters. On one important line the ordinary porter's weekly wage is 15s., rising 1s. per annum to 18s., the limit. They must be 5 feet 7 inches in height and 37 inches chest measurement. The average age on joining is nineteen. They must have a good character, and they must be members of a sick benefit club. When sick, their places are kept open for them fourteen days only. They receive uniform coats, caps, waistcoats, and trousers. Their hours are long, their work hard and often dangerous.

I maintain that (except the last point) the soldier's lot compares most favourably on every point of comparison with the railway porter's.

Allow me now to take an indoor calling.

As I write I have before me an advertisement from a West-end registry office asking for candidates of good character for thirty-four vacancies for footmen, mostly in West-end of London, wages ranging from 16l. to 35l. per annum.

I have also before me particulars as to the male servants employed in one of the clubs to which I belong. The average age is twenty-five years, average weekly wage is 14s. The limits are 18l. to 40l. per annum, exclusive of men in superior position. They receive livery, board and lodging, and, when sick, their places are kept open fourteen days.

Here good character is essential, also presentable appearance, smartness, also technical knowledge—all antecedent to obtaining employment at above wages. Here employment depends on health. Here the man has to save for the bad times of old age or idleness. If married, he has to provide and maintain a separate establishment. I consider that in some ways the soldier's lot compares favourably with the footman's, though perhaps not in all.

I now pass to a very different stratum of life, or rather existence. Having lived for five years in Staffordshire I can endorse every word of the testimony which was discussed in the House of Commons recently, concerning the nail and chain makers of that and the neighbouring county, which I now present to you. Mr. Burnett, the Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade, in his Report of 1888, on above trades, shows that mothers, for a pittance of 4s. or 5s. a week, do the work of slaves on a Cuban plantation. The men are "born to be nailers, to blow huge bellows, and operate ten to thirty pound weight olivers from morning till night, to be skinny, wan, flat-chested, to breathe fœtid air, to account butcher's meat once a week a luxury, and to be deafened with a perpetual babel of rasping sounds. . . . That is their fate. . . . For twelve hours' work a day a chain-maker may expect to gain 10s. to 11s. a week. . . . On this a household can afford to live in a ruined hovel, amid filth, on water gruel."

I shall not waste time in comparing the lot of the soldier with the nail and chain-maker as above authoritatively described, nor will I ask you to follow me into the "Sweater's den," nor to the so-called "home" of the miserable creature who slaves under the iron heel of this the most ghastly oppression that has ever disgraced our country and our common humanity.

There is one more class to be touched upon before I proceed to consider my second point.

The greatest mass of centralized yet unorganized unskilled labour is to be found in East London and at the docks. Two members of the State Colonization Association went to these docks on a certain day and there saw, as Lord Meath describes it, "thousands of half-starved men struggle and fight, aye, literally fight like wild animals, scrambling over the heads of one another and trampling each other down in their efforts to attract the attention of the foreman whose business it is to engage the hands for the day."

What is the pay?—5d. an hour. It sounds good; but Dr. Ogle's Blue Book states that the docker's average earnings in work is 17s. per week. This does not sound bad, but mark! "55 per cent. of the whole number were out of work when the Return was made, and

80 per cent. had been out of work for some time during the four previous months."

The Report of the Mansion House Committee on Metropolitan Distress shows that an average of 8,000 men are turned away daily from the dock gates of London.

In an article entitled, "The Dock Life of East London," published in the "Nineteenth Century," in 1887, it is stated that 13 per cent. of the entire Tower Hamlets population lived below the line of decent life; 22 per cent. on the line of poverty, and "all alike are subject to the physically deteriorating and morally brutalizing conditions which are described. . . . There is a movement downward in the grades of labour. Permanent men are being everywhere dismissed, while preference men are becoming mere casuals. And yet, in spite of this steady shrinkage of employment, we have an increasing drift of low class labour into London."

Here again, I think comparison is needless. Such are the conditions morally, physically, and economically of the classes referred to. What are their prospects? What prospects has the agricultural labourer? At most, a bare subsistence in his old age, most often helped out by aid from children and parish relief; failing these, the union and a pauper's grave. What are the prospects of the chain-maker? A squalid existence, ending in a premature old age of mental and physical decrepitude, from which death is a relief. What those of the sweater's slave and the docker? In too many cases a sure and almost inevitable downward gradation to a level "below that of decency," to a condition of semi-destitution and consequent despair, and many to be merged in the ranks of the pauper, vagrant, and criminal classes.

I have shown what I believe the soldier to be, and what he has on joining. What, then, are his prospects while serving? I say *while serving*. Beyond constant employment, he has the benefit of continued education in Army schools, good-conduct pay, money prizes for proficiency with arms, extra pay for extra employment, ranging from 4d. to 1s. per day. In my regiment there are 152 privates thus paid, and a total of 175 non-commissioned officers and men are employed and receive extra pay for work involving technical instruction. Married soldiers have furnished quarters; their wives earn washing money; families have medical treatment and education free. There are 34,000 positions of non-commission rank, extra paid, open to the soldier; he has the prospect of deferred pay and pension. There are 1,073 posts, held by warrant, open to soldiers. There are 604 commissions, as Quartermasters and Riding Masters, held by soldiers so promoted, and a certain number receive commissions in the ordinary combatant ranks.

I look upon the soldier's work, generally speaking, after he has settled down, as no more than healthy exercise. I think I have shown that it, and the general conditions of his calling, produce good health and long life, and that a good soldier enjoys emoluments, has privileges and prospects of advancement that compare most favourably with those open to his brothers of the wage-earning population.

II. *Recruiting Difficulties.*

Among recruiting difficulties to be faced and overcome, I think that of longest standing is the deep-rooted prejudice among the respectable working classes against soldiering as a calling. To "go for a soldier," and "to go to the dogs," mean the same thing to a large proportion of this class.

Popular prejudice is a dogged foe, and holds out against argument and the logic of demonstrated fact longer than any other. Yet, one must trust, that in time, the steady raising and improving of the soldier's condition, morally, educationally, economically, and, therefore, socially, will have their effect. The fact of the great decrease of crime and drunkenness, and the consequent closing of several military prisons for want of occupants, must tell favourably. The fact that the soldier is better educated and better looked after now than formerly must produce effect in the desired direction. The increasing number of counter-attractions to the low class public-houses, &c., &c., in and out of barracks, in the way of soldiers' institutes and similar places of recreation, must raise the soldier's character in proportion as they are used by him in his spare time.

That the above-named prejudice is breaking down may, in a measure, be proved by the following comparison:—In the 10 years from 1860 to 1869, under the old system, an average of 21,500 men offered their services as soldiers; in the 10 years, 1880 to 1889, the average rose to 58,000. In 1886 the number was actually 75,000.

It may sound a strange doctrine, but I think that the so-called education now in vogue in our Board and other schools is becoming an increasing difficulty in the way of recruiting. I draw a broad distinction between "schooling" and "education;" the schooling now received engenders a distaste for manual labour and for soldiering. The clever, sharp lad, who has a bold adventurous spirit, leaves the plough or the spade, and "goes to town" to seek work as a clerk. The town artisan's son, who can write a good hand and book-keep, disdains the hammer, and becomes a clerk or shopman.

The writer of "Darkest England" says, ". . . . another great evil is the extent to which our education tends to overstock the labour market with material for quill-drivers and shopmen, and gives our youth a distaste for sturdy labour." One example of this: At a registry office one clerkship and one post as carpenter were advertised on the same day; terms offered, 22s. and 25s. per week, respectively; the total applications for the clerkship were 200, and for the other only two!!

The effect of education in this direction on the classes from which our recruits are drawn can only be gauged by a knowledge of the vast strides made in this century. In 1800 there was a total of 3,363 registered schools, in 1866 there were 8,763, in which there were taught 1,082,055 pupils; in 1882 there were 21,362 schools and 3,436,416 pupils. Now there are over 4,000,000 pupils, and over 4,000,000l. spent on education, whereas, in 1830, the Government grant

in aid amounted to but 20,000*l*. Owing to above tendency the cost of skilled labour has so advanced that few skilled labourers of good character will enlist, and the unskilled beginner who sticks to his work and improves, hopes, in time, to earn the higher wage of the skilled, so he is loth "to go for a soldier."

Another very important difficulty in the way of recruiting is the spirit of unrest that pervades the wage-earning population of our times. Speaking of the old days, Mr. A. Forbes says, "There were no professional agitators in those days, nor any barrack-room lawyers who 'knew their rights,' there was not a great deal of that commodity of a little of which the poet speaks as a 'dangerous thing,' and there were no halfpenny newspapers." Of the present, he says, "This is the era of agitation, upheaval, restlessness, strike, and caprice." The truth of this cannot be questioned. There is abroad a spirit of rebellion against restraint, authority, and contract. Men don't like to be tied down or to bind themselves for a long period. This spirit pervades the many. On the other hand, there are some who desire a settlement, they want "fixity of tenure" in their employment, but they look on the Army as only a temporary means of livelihood, they see in it no assurance for the future. Of this more further on.

Another difficulty lies, I think, in the want of full and exact information as to his life, pay, and prospects on the part of the recruit. He is told on enlisting that he will be "all found," and get 1*s*. a day. He finds on joining that he is not "all found," and that he does not receive 1*s*. per day, for out of that 1*s*. per day he has to "find himself" in certain things of which he was given no idea before joining. Hence he starts with rankling discontent in his mind. It may be replied that the War Office has issued a pamphlet giving full information on the matter, and that it can be easily obtained. I don't believe that one in fifty recruits enlisted ever heard of it, much less saw it. I don't believe that pamphlet has any more effect on recruiting than would a compilation from the "*Materia Medica*" or the "*British Encyclopædia*." It is too technical, red tapish, and dry. For the class of men required, something in popular form and language is necessary. You must speak to Tommy Atkins in his own language.

I think each recruit should, before enlistment, be told the lump sum value per week of his emoluments in supplies and money. A card with printed details would amply suffice to make the matter clear. On one side the total value, on the other side the deductions he is liable to.

Again, many writers and speakers on this subject and most soldiers speak of the money handed to the soldier week by week as "his pay!" It is no such thing. It is but the balance of his pay. It is his "pocket money," pure and simple. It is what remains after everything has been paid for necessary to his position, and he may spend it or save it how, when, and where he likes.

This should be made clear to the soldier. A further cause of discontent is in the treatment of the clothing question. Right or wrong, the man does consider it hard and unjust that he should be compelled to give up his time-expired clothing. A servant has not to do so, a

railway porter has not to do so, nor is it done in any similar case in civil life, and the soldier knows this.

To extend, therefore, the system of compensation, and to allow the soldier to keep his time-expired clothing, would be considered a great boon, and would do away with discontent on this head. It would also encourage the man in habits of care, cleanliness, and thrift that would be of great use to him in after life. Further, it would be a saving of money to the State, and prevent certain evils in connection with the sale of so-called worn-out articles to Jew contractors.

Some of the rank and file have been "writing to the papers" lately on the question of hospital stoppages, and one weekly paper has taken the matter up very warmly from the soldier's stand-point. How does the matter really stand?

On going into hospital the man is struck out of mess, he thereby saves 3*d.* per day on his groceries and 1*d.* per day for washing, and, if in hospital for a month, he saves his share of troop or company barrack damages. On the other hand, 7*d.* per day is charged him while in hospital, so that the balance loss in money to the man is, say 3*d.* per day, for which he has medicine, food, and hospital extras, &c. He may not return to health for months, yet he is kept entirely for 3*d.* per day, and his place in the ranks kept open for him. How does this compare with civil life in the same class? At the same time I think it would be well to keep free the man who is suffering from no fault of his own, and charge a higher rate to the man who suffers from his own neglect or misconduct.

In dealing with the financial aspect of any military question, I am conscious of the necessity of one very important obligation. It is necessary that one should possess, metaphorically speaking, a mental squint; while one keeps one eye steadily on the object to be attained, one must keep the other as steadily fixed upon the Treasury, that ever wakeful custodian of the taxpayer's pocket.

The proposals I am about to make are put forward on a basis of the necessities of the case from both points of view, and I may say at once that a change for the better all round will not be produced by adding 1*d.* a day here or there, but that while the pence are not left out of our consideration, the main benefit required will be derived from a judicious readjustment of several important matters, and I hope to show that by such an adjustment there will ensue an actual and tangible saving to the taxpayer, as well as a real improvement in the condition of the soldier in the ranks and in the Reserve.

Mr. Brodrick, M.P., stated the other day, "while, as a rule, there has not been much difficulty about money in England, its expenditure has been rarely judicious."

I had this in view in presenting to you my remarks on the clothing question:

Now with regard to the men's rations, &c., their free ration of bread and meat has to be supplemented by a stoppage of 3*d.* per day for groceries. Now I try in my regiment to give more for that 3*d.* by crediting the troop messing accounts monthly with a share of the profits on the coffee-bar. To do this, I have started a system of

credit. Every man may have a hot supper then for 3d. The bill is paid every week by the troop Officer. The system has worked well for eighteen months without a hitch of any kind. Drunkenness has been so reduced that the total fines for the regiment last year only amounted to 4l. In February the highest total of suppers in one night was 199; in March 195. The result is that the men are not now restricted to dry bread and tea for breakfast, but they have a choice of butter, jam, brawn, beef, or porridge every morning for breakfast.¹ Now, in connection with this, I think it would be a good plan that the whole of the fines for drunkenness should be divided out to all regiments equally—and that the unclaimed balances of soldiers dying intestate should also be so divided. I think such a readjustment would go a long way towards relieving the soldier without adding anything whatever to the burden of the taxpayer.

With regard to "good conduct pay," it should be borne in mind that the scale now in vogue is the same as was in vogue in the days of long service. Instead of a man receiving it as he does now, I think he should have 1d. good conduct pay every two years. The difference to the good soldier would be considerable; to the taxpayer inappreciable.

Money prizes are given for shooting and sword competition, &c., &c. I think money prizes should be given for signalling, map-making, and road reports, &c. This would be productive of greater interest and keener competition.

A minor grievance exists in the stoppage for "cleaning things." If the man must ride in a saddle or wear a coat, I don't see why he should have to pay for articles necessary to keep one clean, and the other the proper colour as to lace and facings; further, why should he pay for the pipe-clay for the belt, which is the property of the taxpayer? These may be deemed trifles, but life is made up in the aggregate of trifles.

I now come to the question of the condition and pay of non-commissioned officers. I think this matter is worthy of very grave consideration. I consider that non-commissioned rank should not be too easily attained, and when obtained should be worth holding. I do not think that the non-commissioned ranks are sufficiently paid when their responsibilities and influence are taken into account. A private with two good conduct badges and extra duty at 6d. per day receives in the cavalry 1s. 10d. per day; a lance-corporal with two good conduct badges 1s. 9d. I would suggest that every corporal who obtains a second-class certificate of education should receive 2d. per diem extra. The case of sergeants is still more important. In the cavalry, very specially we require first-rate men—men who know how to use authority: men who can act with judgment, dash, and effect in independent positions: men who morally, and by experience, are head and shoulders above those over whom they are placed. It

¹ Since writing above, I have reduced charge for groceries to 2d., and the men have a free issue of extras for breakfasts, paid for from profits on canteen and coffee-bar.—F. G.

appears that the Germans are now paying a bounty of 50*l.* to induce sergeants to re-engage. I would suggest that no man should be appointed full sergeant unless he does re-engage. Our trumpeters, drummers, buglers, and pipers must re-engage on appointment as such. Why not a sergeant?

I would, therefore, enhance the value of the rank by allowing the sergeant to go on drawing good conduct pay every two years. I would also allow him to draw re-engaged pay at the rate of 3*d.* per day during his second period of service of five years. If this were done, there would be no difficulty in maintaining the splendid character the non-commissioned ranks have hitherto held, and which has done so much for the Army that they have been called its "backbone." At the close of his service, instead of giving him deferred pay as an inducement to go, I would give him a bounty to remain on.

I now come to what I consider the crux of the whole matter, to the point between service in the ranks and in the Reserve, *i.e.*, "deferred pay."

The language ordinarily used in polite society is quite inadequate to express what I think on this subject. It was introduced, I presume, for a threefold purpose, to be an extra inducement to men to enlist, to stop desertion, and to give the time-expired soldier a good start in civil life. I am strongly of opinion that the prospect of "deferred pay" does not influence one in a hundred men to enlist; men desert mostly early in their service, and that, generally speaking, it is a positive hindrance instead of help to the bulk of men passing into civil life. I sincerely believe that the "lump sum" system of "deferred pay" is an almost unmixed evil, if not an actual curse to the Service.

Sir F. Roberts describes it as "an almost irresistible inducement held out by the State to men to leave the Service just when they are becoming useful to the ranks."

I know no more profligate system of wasting money than that of "lump sum" deferred pay. To place 21*l.* in the hands of a man who has seldom, if ever, had 2*l.* at one time previously, is to place a premium upon his going wrong, especially, be it remembered, that at the same time every bond of restraint and discipline is taken away.

These men, thus paid off, are the cause of much drinking among their comrades; they are the cause of anxiety, trouble, and great annoyance to railway officials and passengers on their way home. The station-master of an important military station informed me personally that the scenes enacted on the departure of reservists sometimes quite beggar description. They arrive home in vast numbers of cases without a penny, and if they do bring money with them, it is soon spent in riotous living with the village loafer and ne'er-do-well.

Evidence as to this can be obtained from recruiting offices, masters of unions, and chief constables all over the Kingdom. I quote one of many. The chief constable of York writes to me, ". . . Very

many men come away with all their deferred pay in their pockets at once, and being, as it were, emancipated from all control, they go on the drink and frequently lose all their money in two or three days."

The temptations which surround and dog the footsteps of the soldier in his daily life are such that on his release from the influence of discipline the possession of 21*l.* is a positive danger to him.

I would suggest that the whole system should be readjusted, and I hope to put before you now a method which will be distinctly helpful to the man and economical to the State.

I propose to do away with the lump sum system as it exists, and substitute the following:—

Pay the man 1*l.* 10*s.* on leaving his corps, and 1*l.* 10*s.* at his home a month later, then spread the balance at 2*d.* per day over his five years' Reserve service. This will start him, and also raise his Reserve pay to 6*d.* per day, not counting 2*d.* per day deferred pay paid to him every year of Reserve service.

Now let us examine this proposal from the taxpayer's point of view.

For every 5,000 men passing to the Reserve after seven years' service the State pays down 105,000*l.* in a lump that year.

Let me present a balance sheet for the first year on 5,000 men, comparing foregoing proposal with present system.

Present system.		Proposed system.			
	£		£	s.	d.
5,000 men at £21.....	105,000	5,000 men × £1 10 <i>s.</i> ...	7,500	0	0
		5,000 " × £1 10 <i>s.</i> ...	7,500	0	0
		5,000 " × 2 <i>d.</i> × 365			
		days.....	15,208	6	8
		Balance Cr.....	74,791	13	4
Total.....	£105,000	Total.....	£105,000	0	0

The balance cr. of 74,791*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* is then spent at the rate of 15,208*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* annually, and dies out at the end of four more years.

By the adoption of my proposal, as set forth above, there would be a gain to the State in this way: there has been an average loss by desertion from the Reserve for the last five years of no less than 1,431 men annually; this means that at the rate of 21*l.* per man paid down, the State has sunk 29,651*l.* in men over whom it has lost all control, a considerable proportion of which would be saved by the adoption of my plan, as a large balance would be in hand. If 14,000 men pass to the Reserve this year, as last, at 21*l.* each, the lump sum paid by the State this year will amount to 294,000*l.*

Again, the Reservist's pay is 4*d.* per day paid quarterly in arrears, and once a year he receives 2*d.* per day deferred pay in arrears, or 3*l.* 10*s.* + his regular Reserve pay. This means practically that once a year he is thus encouraged to have a bigger drink than usual. It is significant that this payment is made about the 1st of April each

year! I would spread this sum at 2*d.* per day over the whole of his Reserve service, and thus raise his pay to 8*d.* per day, and so materially benefit the man, and, as I trust I have shown, prove economical to the State. This sum would keep body and soul together, and if it were paid monthly instead of quarterly as now, I am convinced would absolutely stop desertion from the Reserve.

One of the difficulties of the question is how to harmonize the interests of the 1st Line and those of the Reserve. No one will question the fact that we want more seasoned men in our ranks; but it is said that to allow them to re-engage largely would rob the Reserve. This is true. Yet, if they were thus allowed to re-engage, the present system of deferred pay debars the vast majority from doing so, for before re-engagement the man must pay back 2*l.* received on discharge. To do away with deferred pay as I suggest, and institute *Reserve pay pure and simple*, would remove this hindrance. How then safeguard the Reserve interests? Now, mark well, General Rocke states in his last Report, ". . . the State has, during the last five years, lost the services of upwards of 38,000 men—a loss to be deplored, having regard to the fact that all such men have been trained to arms, and are in the prime of life, i.e., from 30 to 35 years of age." These are men who, having completed five years' Reserve service, decline to enter Section D (Supplemental Reserve). I suggest, therefore, allow any man of good character to re-engage for five years' colour service who will at the same time consent to four years' service afterwards in Supplemental Reserve at the pay allotted to that section. Thus the colour ranks will be stiffened, and the interests of the Reserve safeguarded.

I venture to submit another reason for doing away with the lump sum system of deferred pay. Not only does the Reserve lose 1,400 or more men every year through absence, but year by year a large number become non-effective through death. The Reserve now amounts to, say, 60,000 men, mostly to be found in large centres of population and in the poorest neighbourhoods, where the death-rate is above the average. Let us take the average mortality at 20 per 1,000; this rate would give us a loss to the Reserve of 1,200 men per year from this cause; this means that the State has lost the services of 1,200 men in whom has been sunk 25,200*l.*

I conclude, therefore, that deferred pay should be done away with, and that the terms offered the recruit should be so much while serving in first period, 3*l.* cash within a month of discharge to Reserve, and 8*d.* per day *Reserve pay for five years*. To procure the latter, he has but to live and to demand his money. I maintain that both the soldier and the country would be large gainers, instead of, as now, being losers under a system baneful to the soldier and wasteful to the State.

III. *The Condition of the Army Reserve.*

The condition of the Reservist has, I hold, a great effect for good or ill on the question of recruiting. He is the practical exponent, the living advertisement, of the effects and results of life in the ranks.

If he can speak well of his experience, he becomes an unpaid recruiter. If, on the other hand, he decries the Army, and, should he be in destitute circumstances and attribute his miserable condition to the fact that he cannot obtain work because he is a Reservist, he deters men from enlisting, and acts as a "scarecrow" to would-be recruits.

It should be borne in mind that the bulk of our Recruits are to be found in large centres of population, and that these very centres are more and more prolific than formerly in contributing recruits. General Roche states in his last Report, "The effect of the continued exodus of the working classes into the great industrial centres is but too plainly marked by the decreasing numbers contributed by the rural districts."

Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., in his great speech at Portsmouth on the 2nd inst. said, " . . . I very often hear complaints from working men of low wages and scanty employment. Have you ever considered what is the chief cause of low wages? . . . When you go to your factories and workshops, enquire how many of your fellow-workmen are natives of this town of Portsmouth, and how many have come in from the country districts as competitors to lower your wages and lessen the amount of employment which, as long as the condition of the agricultural labourer is so hard and hopeless, so long as he is condemned to limit his ambition to the miserable sum which will hardly keep body and soul together, so long you may be certain the most active and intelligent and energetic of that class will infallibly be drawn into the towns to seek for work and bring down the rate of wages." Well, these young men do go to London and other centres, and what do they find? They find large numbers of Reservists in a state of semi-starvation, out of work and with no hope of obtaining work because there is a prejudice among civilian employers against taking them on. They find these men in districts described by Mr. Chamberlain as "infested with disease, districts which seem to be permanently handed over to squalor, misery, and crime." They take the condition of the Reservist as they see him as that to which they will as surely descend if they become soldiers, and the recruiting sergeant then charms in vain. That this is the condition of great and increasing numbers of our Reservists is witnessed by such well-known writers as Major C. W. White, General Trench, General Chapman, Mr. Arnold White, *cum multis aliis*. Mr. A. White states that, "out of more than 4,000 men whom he had found in the course of one bleak winter sleeping out of doors like animals, returns it as his conviction that at least 20 per cent. are army men."

I have gone among them myself and bear out the foregoing from actual personal observation. General Trench in his "Dark Side of Short Service" says: "Boycotted and rejected by all, the Reservist has long ago become nobody's child. . . . Large numbers of them swell the population of the lowest classes in the far east-end of London. A large proportion become professional vagrants. . . ." In support of this, he quotes evidence to show that " . . . in one workhouse, 270 men who had served with the colours found relief in

the casual ward." A chaplain to another union writes, "Our Officer of vagrants last year stated that 90 per cent. of our tramps were discharged soldiers, short time men."

In one of the publications of the Howard Association you will find it stated that, "A considerable proportion of the professional vagrants have been in the Army," and, "At present, many discharged soldiers pass on to prison and to crime."

If the foregoing be true, it proves several things clearly to my mind, first, that the 21*l*. deferred pay received has not helped to start these men in civil life, that their 4*d*. per diem is not enough to keep them off the rates, and that many doors of employment are closed to them simply because they are Reservists. I contend, therefore, that to abolish "Deferred Pay" and give the Reservist 8*d*. per day would settle satisfactorily the first two points. I must now examine the pros and cons of the last.

I maintain that the man who has served his country at the possible risk of his life; has suffered, possibly, in that service; and has ended his service with a good record, has special claims on the State first, and then on the individual employer of labour.

I maintain that if the idea is allowed to gain ground that the State practically ignores, and that the civilian employers of labour, generally speaking, boycott the Reservist, the greatest injury will be the result upon recruiting prospects.

Allow me to deal with the State first. It does not form part of my functions here to-day to formulate an attack upon any particular department or individual in connection with this matter; I am dealing with a system, and in so doing, I recognize no such thing as a "muzzling order" as applying to discussions in this theatre. I say, therefore, that, generally speaking, our State treatment of the Reservist is utterly ill-advised, uneconomical, and injurious to all concerned. It is downright humbug for the State to appeal to the patriotism of the great employers of labour to employ Reservists if the State fails to set the example. Not only does the State not set a useful example in this matter, but obstacles are put in the way of Reservists being employed, for I find a certain rule in existence, I need not say where, which runs, "From the pay in each case, no matter what the situation may be, the amount of army pension or Reserve pay, if any, will be deducted, so that the total payment shall not exceed the remuneration of a civilian of equal standing." This means that the State who claims the right for 4*d*. per day to send the man forth as food for powder and shot expects him to render the same day's work for a less wage than that received by a civilian over whom no such right exists. Is this just? To my mind it is contemptible. The position of the Reservist is exceptional; the State has exceptional claims upon him, I therefore contend he has claims upon the State of an exceptional character, and that the State should treat him as one of a privileged class. Can this be done? I think so; and with great advantage to the State, the man, and the prospects of recruiting.

General Chapman says that "there are at least 2,000 posts outside

regimental life that could be profitably filled by Reservists." I agree with him.

There are also a great number of posts filled by men borne on the strength of regiments as fighting units that would be equally well filled by Reservists, and with this great advantage, that the men of regiments would be released to their proper work.

Take my own regiment as an example: it is on war footing, the men are supposed to be practising in peace what they will have to perform in war, but my ranks are depleted to furnish men of good character and long service to the remount depôts at Dublin and Woolwich, the military troop at Sandhurst, the military offices, school and canteen locally, also as divisional and brigade orderlies, messengers, and postmen. I maintain that every one of these posts should be filled by Reservists, and that my men should revert to their regiment.

Then in a regiment, all servants, Officers' and sergeants' mess waiters, storemen, cooks, school assistants, canteen waiters, and some clerks should be Reservists. Of the 4,000 or more cavalry Reservists, how many have been on a horse since they left the colours? Not one in a hundred; but by thus bringing them back they can have a course of riding and shooting periodically, and they would then require less "knocking into shape" in a time of crisis.

The same applies to infantry. I have before me, as I write, a Return showing 96 rank and file employed in work that takes them from soldiering, and yet this Return is from a regiment in 1st Army Corps.

To sum up. If the State will open such posts to Reservists; if the Post Office will employ Reservists for mail carts, also as sorters and carriers; if Woolwich Arsenal and Enfield (which employ 13,000 labourers) will take them on; if the Public Offices will employ them as messengers and porters; if many clerkships in Government offices were filled by Reservists; the State might then fairly go to the civilian employers of labour and say, "Follow my example and find employment for, and stand by, the men who are the followers of those who have bled and died to make our nation what it is, and who are still bound, in the time of their country's need, to risk their lives in order to pull the British chesnuts out of the fire, and by so doing to ensure peace and prosperity to their fellow subjects."

As it is, the condition of thousands of Reservists is pitiable. Paymasters testify to the great trouble caused by constant changes of address by Reservists, proving non-employment. Chief Constables testify to their misery as deterrent to recruiting. The Hon. G. A. Anson writes me from Stafford: "I think more of the better class of recruits would be obtained if the status of discharged soldiers were more enviable." Recruiting sergeants write to say how they are hindered in their work by unemployed Reservists. I quote one who says, "I believe I am right in saying the greatest enemy to recruiting is our Army Reserve." Why? Because thousands of them are sunk in a state of hopeless despair. As Mr. Chamberlain pleaded for the

agricultural labourer, so I plead for the Reservist. Give him back "the solace and the promise of hope"—

"Hope, of all the ills that men endure,
The only cheap and universal cure,
The captive's freedom, and the sick man's health,
The lover's victory, and the beggar's wealth."

The Secretary of State for War said in the House of Commons, that "in the report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting there is a good deal to cause alarm." I see one cause of alarm, namely, that if the present condition of masses of our Reservists is not improved, and that soon, we shall see the general standard of physique further lowered, and we shall have to accept the very dregs of the labour market, and when a crisis arises, we shall have to reinforce our regiments by sweeping up the Reservists from the stone heaps by the roadside, and from the bank of oakum in the casual ward; to find them wan, gaunt, hungry, drooping conscripts of destitution and despair brought back to the ranks to fight in the interests of those who have neglected them and allowed them to starve; and yet they will fight, and then, in the hour of victory, the churches of our land will ring with Te Deums of praise, and on his return the soldier will be greeted by vast, thronging, cheering crowds, and march to his quarters under triumphal arches and mottoes of welcome, to the heart-stirring strains of "Home, Sweet Home." What then? When the victory won has ceased to be a nine days' wonder; when the victors have been praised, feasted, and fêted; what then? What is his home to be? Is he to be allowed to go back to the tramps' lodging, in a filthy slum, or to the casual ward? God forbid! Let us hope and trust for a better state of things. Let us, one and all, work shoulder to shoulder to ameliorate and raise the position and condition of the Reservist, and to restore to him "the solace and the promise of hope," in order that it may never again be written of our nation that—

"When war is over and affairs are righted,
God is forgotten and the soldier slighted."

General DASWOOD: Sir Arthur Herbert, ladies, and gentlemen, I think there can be no doubt that the recruiting difficulty is a real one and not imaginary, although the reports of the brigade depôts are not so bad as we might suppose. In the reports the word "Fair" often occurs; it is often understood in reports of that sort that the word "Fair" means "Bad, but I do not like to say so." As to the causes assigned to this recruiting difficulty, they are various. Some three or four years ago the "Times," which is supposed to be the leader of public opinion, said that the fault was with the Officers, more especially the Commanding Officers, who did not take interest in their men, and who, moreover, were harsh to them. I think we all know that was an unfounded accusation and very unjust; but at the same time, when an accusation of that sort is made, the reason is to hide the real delinquents, the Government of the day; but still an accusation of that kind is very apt to "catch on" (as the Yankees say) with the masses, and they believe in it, especially the Radicals. Last year people took up a new idea, and they said, "The discipline of the Army is too severe," and a great deal was written on the subject, and very pernicious nonsense in my opinion. One man wrote that it was very hard that a soldier should be severely punished for an offence that in civil life would merely

entail a fine of a few shillings. A statement of that sort shows that the man, whoever he might be, knew nothing whatever about the matter, and that the very rudiments of discipline were altogether absent from his mind. There have been a great many articles written also in magazines, and I should like to touch shortly on one written by Mr. Archibald Forbes, in the "Nineteenth Century," of February or March. Mr. Archibald Forbes, in speaking of the private soldiers of twenty-five years ago, at the time when I was a regimental Officer, says that they were habitually addressed by their Captains as "D— brutes." I say that is a most monstrous statement to make, and a most atrocious libel on the Officers of the Army generally. It is altogether at variance with the good feeling that obtains between Officers and men, and I say further it is altogether opposed to what is one of the chief corner-stones of discipline and efficiency, namely, the mutual respect that exists between Officers and men. The statement is unjust and untrue, and moreover is a spiteful remark made by a man against his social superiors. With regard to the real causes of the recruiting difficulty, of course we know that sufficient inducements are not offered. Unfortunately the opinions of the Officers of the Army, and the opinions of those who rule, do not always agree. In foreign countries the Officers are believed, and notice is taken of what they say. Here I cannot say that they are. In foreign countries the people insist that the Army shall be to a great extent managed by soldiers, because, having been invaded by foreign Powers, it has brought home to them the real necessity of defence. That is not the case in this country, and until something of the same sort takes place we shall find it hard to get a change. Then there are other causes. We have two sets of people looking at the thing from entirely different starting points. The Officers of the Army say, "We must have efficiency as economically as may be, but at all events efficiency." On the other hand politicians start with the idea that "We must have cheapness. If we can palm off upon the people a spurious efficiency and at the same time get credit for the economy we shall be all right, and we shall get their votes." This is most unfortunate. Colonel Graves, in his interesting lecture, has apparently tried to make out—I do not say he has not done so—that the position of the soldier is quite equal, if not better, than that of an ordinary man who is not a skilled mechanic. The point is, are the great mass of people whom we want to attract to the colours of that opinion, or are they not? If they are not of that opinion, although it is perfectly correct on paper, then those inducements must be increased. A statement has been made with regard to stoppages, and I am very glad to see that the question has been raised in the House of Commons, especially as to the sea kits; but it was rather amusing that the Secretary of State for War, in promising to see about these sea kits, gave the very curious excuse that he had only just heard of them. This question of sea kits has been before the public for some time, and the Army have known it, of course, since its introduction. There is another point which has not been brought forward before the House of Commons through the apparent apathy of so-called military members, and that is that a soldier landing in India is put under stoppages to the amount of 30s. for kaki and white clothing. The compensation he receives from the Government only amounts to 15s. When I was in India, in 1883, the expense of kaki uniform was very much increased by the dress fads of the Officer at that time commanding the Bombay Army, but I am glad to say that on the arrival of his successor, this ridiculous kaki pattern was abolished. Many remarks have also been made by Colonel Graves, in which I quite agree, as regards Reserve men and the deferred pay. Of course the reason why the Government will not throw open numerous berths to Reserve men is because they do not want to give up their patronage. Members of both Houses will not give up the power of appointing people who really have no claim on the State. Numerous berths in the public offices are held by men who were servants to Cabinet Ministers and others; men who thus obtain one of these posts are said to have come through the pantry. I want to see the reverse of that, and the way to such employment lie not through the pantry or the scullery or the kitchen, but through the barrack room. I want to see the Army made a stepping stone to certain berths which should be kept for soldiers. At present it is not so. With regard to enlistment, I should propose that every man should be enlisted for a term of seven years with the right, pro-

viding that he was medically fit, and was recommended by his Commanding Officer, to re-engage for a further seven years with a slight increase of pay; at the end of the fourteen years he should be entitled to re-engage until twenty-one years, under the same conditions, which would entitle him to a pension. Every soldier should serve in the Reserve or with the colours for twenty-one years, and at the age of forty-four every Reserve man should get a pension according to the time he has served with the colours. Of course we know the people at large say we cannot have pensions because of the expense; but they forget that, if you give a man so much a day and deprive him of a prospective pension, you are really offering him less than before. They never see that, and in the case of deferred pensions of course this inducement acts upon every man who joins the Army; but at the same time a great many men do not live to earn it, whereas if you increase a man's pay, and he dies, you have to pay somebody else; therefore there is a good deal to be said on the pension side. I think also that deferred pensions would obviate the difficulty of men who refuse to go into the Supplemental Reserve. All I can say is, if the people of this country will not pay either in coin or in equivalent, coupled with indirect advantages sufficient to procure an efficient Army, unless they are willing to suffer annihilation by a foreign Power, they must submit to a taxation of flesh and blood, in other words, Conscription.

Lieut.-General DUNNE: After the admirable and eloquent lecture which we have heard, I trust that I may be pardoned by you, Sir, and the lecturer for making one or two little semi-critical remarks on some of the points he has brought forward. The admirable plan adopted in the 20th Hussars of increasing the evening meal and giving supper, &c., seems to be in great measure founded on the profits derived from liquor. Now you, Sir, when at the Curragh, may remember that we had a medical Officer much more fitted to be a Methodist parson, who managed to make temporary total abstinents of upwards of 300 of my men. If he had made permanent teetotallers of some 600, where, then, would the profits of the canteen have been? It is not a plan, I think, that Colonel Graves can rely upon, although it is a very excellent thing as long as it lasts. Now, as regards the point of extra pay for these Reserve men in the Supplemental Reserve, it comes to this: that after seven years, Colonel Graves says they are to be persuaded to serve on for five more years with an agreement that they will then remain for four years more in the Supplemental Reserve. Seven, five, and four make sixteen. Will a man serve for sixteen years, the best part of his life, if he is not in some way offered a permanent pension at the finish? Every Commanding Officer, I am sure, will endorse the remarks of the lecturer as regards the immense benefit we should all have derived in the past, when we commanded regiments, and those who are now commanding them would derive, if all these extra offices, orderlies and regimental and garrison men required for different services, if all these employments were given to Reservists. But then comes the question of the money, for it might mean at least 10 per cent. added to the expense of our Army, less the Reserve pay of these men, because at least 10 per cent. of the strength of every regiment is used up more or less in that sort of way. I am sure that every old soldier will agree with the eloquent peroration of the lecturer on the subject of the present state of the Reservists, and that every word that has been spoken by him is to a great extent correct; but still there is one thing which I think might be borne in mind, and that is, that the entire employment of Reservists would be attended with some difficulty (I have employed pensioners four or five times myself; I have found them often given to liquoring up, very conceited, and troublesome, and, in some cases, totally impracticable in private houses; they were always talking of what Captain this and Colonel that did for them). What I mean is, that if the Government were to employ nothing but Reservists within the walls of the Foreign and all the public Offices, what a terrible collapse there would be on the declaration of war! Those are the only points on which I venture to criticize the lecture, which I assure you I have listened to with the greatest possible interest. At the same time—I hope the lecturer will pardon me—I cannot help expressing a slight feeling of disappointment, for I did hope that an Officer of his undoubted ability, with such experience, and who has worked out the whole thing so well, would have offered us a prescription of such a strong and effective description that would have entirely allayed that feverish excitement

which somehow or other has arisen in the country just now on the subject of recruiting. I believe not only myself but all the Army will agree on the value of the points that he has recommended; but still the question comes very much to what General Dashwood said, Are these allurements sufficiently enticing to get exactly the right sort of men that we at the present moment require? The sort of men who enlist probably from hunger, from some female or some poaching difficulty, are they likely to be deeply impressed with what the lecturer has so clearly and distinctly shown to be the advantages of military life over civilian? If War Office pamphlets do not induce men to enlist, as he himself said, I do not think that even all he has suggested on the subject to-day will catch the right people; I do not think that his alterations will be sufficient to meet our difficulties in an age when *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* is, I am sorry to say, not of the slightest use in tickling the hearts of the young labouring men of this land. The other day, when Colonel Dooner was lecturing, I said in despair, that I believed the only thing would be ultimately that we should have recourse to the ballot for the Militia; but since then I have read up and talked to people as to the state of the ballot in the years of the old Peninsular War, and there is no doubt whatever that the system of paying substitutes was so bad that it entailed the enlisting into our Army of a vast number of blackguards; they were not worthless blackguards, because they proved afterwards that they were good fighting ones. I am afraid, notwithstanding all the lecturer has said, that there is no manner of doubt that it comes to this, that at the present moment our recruits are too young, and that no increase of pay that the country will ever consent to will get us the older ones. The difficulty is that regiments nowadays, from short service, require from four to five times the number of these youthful recruits that they did in old-days, and I cannot help thinking that unless the country will pay for keeping up large home establishments in order to develop these boys into men, they will have to pay, either with bribes of higher pay, bounty, or pension, that class of men which they absolutely require for service abroad and for active service also. Were I to go into the recruiting question and into the weaknesses that exist in "our great old Constitutional force," owing to the present system of our enlisting, I should occupy at least another ten minutes.

Lieutenant-General FRASER, U.C., M.P.: I would say but one word after the most eloquent lecture we have heard; I am most happy to have been here. Whether in one or two minutes I agree, has nothing to do with it. I rise merely to say, as an Officer remarked that perhaps by reason of the apathy of the Service Members of the House of Commons, a question has not been brought forward referring to what we used to call in India the *kharkee* kits, I can only assure you that that question was amply brought forward. The daily papers do not report everything that is said in Committees by Members of the House of Commons who have served in the Navy and in the Army; but be assured that, whatever our apathy might be, we look to your interests.

Captain HUGH PEARSE (Adjutant 3rd Vol. Batt. East Surrey Regt.): There is only one proposal in Colonel Graves' very interesting lecture to which I venture to suggest an amendment: that is, his proposed substitution of Reserve pay for deferred pay. I admit that his proposed system of payment would be a great improvement on the present ruinous throwing-away of money; but in my opinion it would be a much better plan to reorganize the Reserve altogether. Colonel Graves says that he cannot express his opinion of deferred pay in polite terms, but he says, (1) "It does not induce one man in a hundred to enlist;" and (2) "It is a positive hindrance instead of help to the bulk of men passing into civil life." In short it is a failure, both as regards the State that pays it and the soldier who receives it. If these are facts, what inducement can there be to continue paying a large sum annually which is both useless and harmful? The fact is that the interests of the Home Army and of the individual soldier are sacrificed to the formation of a Reserve. In a voluntary Army, such as ours is, it is an anomaly that the majority of men in a branch of that Army should be kept in it against their will. But I believe that the majority of the 1st Class Army Reserve would give anything to get out of it: either to be civilians pure and simple, which would give them a better chance of getting employment, or to return to the colours. In proof

of this I will mention that when men were allowed to return to the colours by refunding their deferred pay at the rate of 6d. a day—a very heavy stoppage for a soldier to submit to voluntarily—so large a number flocked back, that the authorities, in alarm, stopped the privilege and insisted that the deferred pay should be refunded in a lump, which of course the men could not do. My contention is that neither deferred pay nor increased Reserve pay should be given to tempt men into a Reserve in which they cannot support themselves and in which they are a hindrance to recruiting and a burden on the country, instead of being useful citizens and trustworthy soldiers. It would be better to return to a long-service Army, which would be a real safeguard to the country, than to have an inefficient¹ home Army with an impoverished and discontented Reserve which has lost the habit of discipline and would, if called up, simply disorganize the battalions into which it would have to be drafted.

Colonel Hon. CHARLES BYNG (1st Life Guards): I must first claim your indulgence while I endeavour to add my mite of support to the most excellent lecture that we have just heard from Colonel Graves. I think he has spoken thoroughly to the point, and I heartily go with him, and even beyond in some points. First of all, with regard to inducements to recruiting, I think he is quite right; let us tell the ranks from which the recruits are drawn what they have got to expect; let us talk to Tommy Atkins in his own language; let him know what he is to receive as his pocket money, and if it is possible, and I think it can be done, let us abolish stoppages. Stoppages are what I, when I had the honour to command a troop, used to find the only trouble I had with my men, because, on the monthly settlement, they wished to know, why this, and why that? Now, I think by doing away with stoppages, letting the man know that he has so much money to receive, and providing other things free, you will make him happier and contented. With regard to clothing, let us look at it in the same way as the livery of domestic servants, and I think it is a very fair way to look at it. We soldiers are all servants of Her Majesty. I am all for letting the clothing be the property of the wearer, and if through some means or another (either that a man is a batman or employed in some way or other) he does not wear it out, let him sell it to some comrade who has been unfortunate enough to spoil a good stable jacket or tunic. The smart men will generally be picked for the hard work, orderlies, and escorts, and they will wear out their clothes very frequently faster than some of their less smart comrades. Then, with regard to the recruit on joining, no doubt the bait which catches our fish is the smart tunic or jacket, or something of that sort, and the young fellow, on joining, expects, in a week at least, to be able to walk outside the barracks with the same jacket on as he has seen the man who has brought him up wear; instead of which he is given partly-worn clothing, possibly it may be the jacket or tunic of some non-commissioned officer, which bears the marks where the chevrons have been cut off, and the lace has been removed; perhaps the marks where the ribands carrying the medals have been: in fact, it is a shabby article, very often dirty, especially when a scarlet one; and that disgusts the young soldier, and induces a great number to purchase their discharge under the 10l. rule, at present in existence. With regard to deferred pay, I go heartily with Colonel Graves. He says in his lecture that "deferred pay does not induce 1 in 100 men to enlist." I sincerely believe that the lump sum system of deferred pay is an almost unmitigated evil, if not an actual curse to the Service. I think that, to induce thrift and habits of economy, the regimental savings bank should be brought under the notice as much as possible of every man, and that he should be encouraged to deposit his savings in it. I do not wish to take praise to myself, but I was once in the proud position of being able to tell a General at inspection that every man in my troop put into the savings bank. You may say that a man, by this means, would take away an equally large sum with him. Every man, when he leaves, must be going to some destination, for the regiment is very rarely quartered in the town in which he lives. Why should not

¹ Inefficient from no fault of its Officers or men, but from being made a mere training depot for the troops abroad.

the money that this man has in the regimental savings bank be transferred to the Post Office Savings Bank at his future home? I think the more you can encourage thrift and saving amongst the men the better. They will then have got into the habit of carefulness with regard to money, and they will not be so inclined to spend all their money at once, as they are under present circumstances, when a lump sum is handed to them, of which they have never seen any part before; of which they have not been deprived, and of which they have not felt the want. If they have the money, and then put it into the savings bank, they are depriving themselves of something; therefore, I think if you can get them to put money into the savings bank it is far better than keeping it as deferred pay, which I am afraid is generally the cause of the troop or the company having a carouse, and generally taking away some good-conduct badges. Then with regard to education; no doubt we are all very much educated nowadays, and we all read the papers, and the papers are now brought so much before us on account of their cheapness that, even if a recruit or a soldier of many years' standing is more or less inclined to be happy, somebody who reads more tells him that he is not happy, and goes on reading extracts from papers to prove to him that he is not happy, and the poor fellow begins to think he is not happy. Let us put ourselves in his place, and endeavour to make him as happy as we can, and so disprove what these agitators say by making his home as comfortable as possible, his barrack room as nice as possible. I have read speeches that have been made here, showing that Officers commanding regiments and battalions have tried all they can to meet this difficulty; but I think there is one little thing which I have not noticed to have been suggested so far, and if any credit is due to this or any remark I have made now, I can only say that it has been suggested by a long conversation that I have had with an Officer who at present holds the position of Adjutant to my regiment, whose advice I have asked on the subject, and whose opinions I value most highly. I only wish he were here to-day, because I am certain he could explain better what I am endeavouring to explain now. His suggestion, in which I agree with him, is that in the barracks there should be a room by the guard room, or as near as possible, in which visitors coming to see soldiers should be allowed to sit down and wait; instead of, as we have often had to see, people hanging about the gate, obstructing the entrance of those whose business it is to go in, and, very often, owing to the crowd that collects outside the gate, improper characters are enabled to get inside. If we could only have an ordinary room, with a few seats, where a man can go and meet his friends, it would be a very great advantage to the soldier. There is nothing, I think, that better shows that a man is happy than that his father, mother, sister, brother, and relations of all sexes should come and see him. I want them to come and to see him, and to see that he is happy, because when they go away they can say to each other, "Bob is very happy there; the sooner Harry joins the better." I cordially agree with Reserve men being employed as servants, &c., so as to avoid the necessity of employing men in the regiment. I think by this means Officers commanding regiments and battalions might have an opportunity of seeing their regiments and battalions on parade. I am given to understand that the General Officer Commanding at Aldershot has struck off each brigade in turn from camp duties in order that Officers may have an opportunity of seeing their men; and I think all these posts, such as servants, orderlies, cooks, and canteen men, might be very well filled by Reservists. Let them come up each year or biennially, for a month or two months' drill, say in October and November, after any summer or autumn drill that there might have been going on. For example, they would be able to groom the horses in the cavalry, and thereby allow a greater number of men to go on furlough, and so make the Army more popular. Then there is another thing. It has been said that we never teach our soldiers anything. Let us try and institute schools for learning trades in the regimental districts and at the big camps. Surely, if in prison you teach a prisoner to do useful things, why should not you teach soldiers trades that would be useful to them after they have left the Service? Could not they make some part of their clothing? Could not they make boots? Could not they do carpentering work? And I should be very much disappointed if, amongst pensioners or Reservists, there are not men of sufficient ability to act as instructors.

Let them have a little shop to sell these things at, and allow the instructor and his pupils to receive a percentage on all articles sold.

Captain R. D. WYNARD: I do not think any apology is necessary from me for addressing remarks to the many senior Officers whom I see here, for this reason: I think a junior Officer, such as I am myself, has many more opportunities of getting hold of the opinions of the private soldier of the present day than a General Officer. I think a man will speak his mind more freely to the Captain of his company than to the General Officer who inspects his battalion. I have for four years acted as Adjutant of a regimental district, and have therefore been brought in daily contact with recruits in the first three months of their service, before they go to join their Line battalion. Colonel Grives has stated that great numbers of our recruits are too young, and that at certain periods of pressing need many are enlisted who do not fulfil the conditions of the physical requirements for their calling. In support of this statement, I think this "period of pressing need" must exist at the present time, for this reason: during the year 1890, 369 recruits for the Regular Army were raised at the headquarters of the 31st Regimental District at Kingston-on-Thames; of these, only 143 men came up to the standard, the remaining 226 being enlisted under special authority from the Horse Guards. In support of the opinion expressed by the lecturer, that "the prospect of deferred pay does not influence one in a hundred men to enlist," I will recount the following circumstance, which occurred only yesterday. Ten men presented themselves for enlistment into the Regular Army at our barracks at Kingston-on-Thames. I got them together in the presence of the recruiting Officer, and, with his permission, questioned them, and there was not one of those ten men who had ever heard of deferred pay; they did not know what it was, and, in spite of leading questions on the subject, I could get no nearer answer or opinion from any one of them than this: one man had heard that after he had done his seven years colour service he would get what he called a bounty, but whether it was 1*l.* or 50*l.*, he had not any idea whatever. No doubt, a lump sum of 21*l.* down is an inducement to leave the colours which few men can resist. As regards the sufficiency of the soldier's pay, I think there are few men in civil life, of the class from which the recruits are drawn, who have their 3*s.* or 4*s.* a week hard cash in pocket-money on the weekly pay day, and I know, from inspection of the pay list, that this is about the average sum that they get, after having paid for their food, clothing, accommodation, and everything else. But I think that the pay of those who re-engage should be increased, for this reason: I do not think it is fair that a veteran of twenty-one years' service should receive exactly the same pay as a recruit of two days, and I do not think the men think so either, and I think we should pay the non-commissioned officers, as well as the men, a somewhat higher rate on re-engagement. As regards good-conduct pay, every man in receipt of good-conduct pay has earned it, and richly deserves it, if the system of deprivation of badges is strictly carried out. One point that the lecturer has not touched upon, and which I think a very serious one, is the presence in the ranks of fraudulent enlisters. "Frauds" I think are very much against recruiting, for they do not make the soldier's life in his barrack room a happy one. There are men who make a trade of deserting and re-enlisting. If this could be stopped, the soldier's life would be a pleasanter one, and the taxpayer would be saved large sums of money. The only means to this end appears to me to be the tattooing of every man who joins Her Majesty's Service. I am tattooed myself, and I know the process is not nearly as painful as the recruit's course of musketry with the Martini-Henry rifle. I would suggest the insertion in the attestation paper of this question, "Are you willing to be tattooed?" after the existing one, "Are you willing to be vaccinated?" In proof of my statement—at least, I have not stated it yet—that tattooing is almost universal among the class from which our recruits are drawn, I have looked over the attestations in my possession, and I find that during last month we enlisted in the East Surrey Regiment fifty-five men, forty-three of whom were tattooed; so that I think the practice popular amongst the class from which the men are enlisted. If Officers were to set the example, the royal cipher tattooed on every person who has served his Queen would soon become an honourable distinction.

Major-General SINGE: It seems to me that there was an all but universal feeling

that an increase of expenditure upon the Army might attain the object which was brought forward at Colonel Dooner's lecture. Colonel Graves at that time spoke rather against it, if I understood him correctly, and, although unable to be present earlier to-day, having carefully studied Colonel Graves' paper, it seems to me that he has established, beyond all power of shaking, the fact that, as far as monetary considerations are concerned, the soldier is at anything but a disadvantage. In establishing his premiss, however, I think also that Colonel Graves has put his finger upon the darkest blot on the whole country's social life, and it is one that must affect the Army indirectly, for it does not improve or affect the soldier's position *per se*, that civilians of certain classes of corresponding social rank are existing in a state that would shame any barbarian that has ever existed on the face of the earth. That does not enter into the question; it is a scandal and a shame and a reproach, of which every Englishman has to bear his portion, so long as it is suffered to continue. It should be an utter impossibility that our fellow human beings should be brought to the condition that the lecturer has irresistibly shown to exist; still, I say again, that this does not affect the question which has been so very practically and concisely put by some of the speakers. We have to look not so much at what, in the abstract, might be, and would be if our social life were governed by higher considerations. The practical point is this: we must either have a voluntary Army, or we must pay a tax in flesh and blood. Neither does the degradation of certain unhappy classes touch the question and principle of improving the soldier's position in every way, so as to induce men to qualify themselves for becoming first-rate non-commissioned officers, and then to cling to remaining with the colours they have learned to love. I thought I had lived too long for my own happiness, but really I am quite glad to find some very young-looking members of this Institution here who seem to remember the days when that onslaught was made upon the character of the gentleman Officer, that time when the "Times" poured forth its endless streams, as if the most obnoxious things in the whole Army were its gentlemen. It was at that time also that the practice was introduced on which the lecturer has so rightly animadverted, of withholding from the man who had served his Sovereign and his country something that was his due, and, to all intents and purposes, fining him for taking employment and robbing him in the performance of that employment, simply because he had done his soldier work as well. On one point I am very anxious, and this is that that scandalous abuse of deferred pay, of which both lecturers have made such emphatic mention, and in which they carried both audiences with them, should not be mixed up with the intention and right application of an indispensable provision, by which the soldier in the Reserve shall continue a soldier, a numerical reality and efficient, and yet induced and enabled to re-enter the grooves of a civil calling. I should like very much to get an answer from the lecturer to this point, whether he would not favour, by all means in his power, supposing such a thing were put into practical and positive form, the responsible employment of Reserve men under Government stipulations, such that they shall be able to be called up for training just as the Militia are; without loss of employment; that they shall be fitted for employment and ensured employment, applying to such purpose the money now spent with a folly which has brought odium on a provision necessary, but never yet applied, and so, practically speaking, never really made, but squandered with a profligacy beyond bounds. I do not altogether feel as if the increase of the Reserve pay to 8d. a-day, or to any other sum, would entirely meet this object, as Colonel Graves supposes. I should like to engage his attention to this point, not for an immediate answer, but that he should well weigh his proposal in the light of the use to which the typical Reservist now puts his retaining fee. And for this reason I will give you an example, if I may, from what has happened to me within a few days. A man dropped from the clouds, if I may so say, some six or nine months ago, whom I had never seen before. He had heard of me from some one else, and came to place himself in my hands to get work, and for me to help him, if I possibly could, to cure his tendency to go on the booze. He placed himself altogether in my hands; he was a very useful all-round man, of singular intelligence, and above the average ability. He had been trained as orderly-room clerk, and was a good workman besides. So far as concerned the struggle with his strong temptation, he seemed to go on admirably for about six months; but I then knew

that there was something going to break down. Instead of coming to me to sign his paper, he slipped off. In forty-eight hours all his Reserve quarterly pay was gone, his clothes were pawned, and he was knocking at the door for shelter. Now I am afraid the course of the Reservist is very much like this, when he has had his first great deferred-pay booze, he goes first to the barrack room and sponges slightly; there he is very kindly treated; he afterwards finds old Officers under whom he has served. I was in the Royal Engineers, and the Indian Engineers were at that time entirely distinct, so I never went to India; but the number of men who have served under me in India is quite wonderful. They remember me perfectly well; only unfortunately I have not been to any one of the places where they have served under me. This sort of thing very soon leads to begging and lying from door to door. Now, I want to cut at the root of the difficulty which leads to these great evils, which do so much to injure the true soldier at the other end of the scale. One of the leading temptations to the Reservist's downward course is that distaste and disability for civil manual occupations which prompted him to preference for the soldier's life. When a man joins the Reserve he has immediately got to look out for himself, instead of having to look up to others. There is a class of Reservists and Recrvists. The good men are not the cause of any trouble; it is the bad or the indifferent who go downwards, and must be under control if they are to be helped to better ways. Can you wonder that he fails when the three conditions in which alone he is under that control, and in which the State supports or assists him, are that of the soldier with the colours, which he has just been induced to relinquish, that of the pauper, and that of the gaol bird? Towards these he gravitates as by a natural law. But ensure him employment, keep him under such control as may be necessary to link maintenance and work indissolubly together, and things only need to be rightly administered to ensure the result. I am thoroughly persuaded that the remunerative employment of, and the recovery of a great many of those men can be absolutely secured. The application of deferred pay or its equivalent to these, its apparently intended purposes will, I believe, be the much better way of applying it than to allotting it, that the Reservist, if he will, shall, in the course of five years, have twenty boozes, instead of having one big one at the beginning, then twenty lesser ones, and in either case going into the union or into gaol at the end. I need not say how thoroughly I have been delighted with the lecture, nor how much I thank Colonel Graves for giving his attention to a subject that is all-important if conscription is not to prevail.

Lieutenant-Colonel WHITTINGTON: You have all heard from the regimental and from the combatant part of the Service here, about Reservists. I thought a few words from myself, having been a Paymaster for the last eleven years, and having seen a great deal of the Reserve, having mobilized and demobilized them three times, and having been in Bury, which is one of the worst parts for the Reserve, for they are always passing through there to tell you what a wretched state they are in, might be of some advantage. I do not think you have any idea of the distress of some of the Reservists who are knocking about the country, particularly in the north of England. I have seen them without food, no doubt for several days, sleeping under ricks and hedges, going to the casual ward, and tramping from one part of England to the other. Ask any of them, and they say they would give anything to return to the colours again, but there is that one thing, they cannot go back unless they'll pay 18*l.* 5*s.* or 21*l.* A man starts first of all in this way, we teach him to be a smart fellow, to be cleanly in his habits, and we, in every way, try to make a better man of him, and at the end of seven years we undo it almost in one day. We give him 21*l.* to spend in drink, we send him down to his village in a suit of clothes that he is utterly ashamed of, we do not even allow him to buy a better suit to go down with. My idea is you cannot do away with deferred pay at once, if you do away with it eventually, but you must do it gradually. All men serving, remember, have vested interests, and they must be met. Every man now serving must have his deferred pay. Although they must have that deferred pay, I would give a man who has, say, 3*l.* coming to him, 1*l.* down, and let him spend the 2*l.*, if he wishes it, in clothes. I would give a man who has 21*l.* coming to him, two suits of clothes, if he like to buy them, producing the bill from the tailor he has purchased them from, and I would give him the remainder

by instalments of 1*l.* a week until it was spent. By that means you would give him time to get to work, and you would prevent his spending the 21*l.* in drink.

Colonel GRAVES: That is for the vested interests?

Lieutenant-Colonel WHITTINGTON: Yes. To induce men to go into the Service I would offer greater advantages, by what I would call good service pay at certain periods. I would treat the recruit for the first year as an apprentice, and then I would increase his pay. I would make more warrant officers—I think that would be a great inducement to men to stay—and I would always let a man come back from the Reserve, if he liked within a year, to the colours without paying anything back again. We want these older men to keep the young fellows in order. Look at the boys we have in our regiments; no one to tell them anything. I remember when I was a youngster that even old soldiers would come to me to ask my advice as an Ensign, and I am sure very often they could tell me a great deal more than I could tell them; but I was an Officer. Upon my word I do not think that ever happens now. I do not think there is the same feeling between the soldier and the Officer as there used to be; I think it is gone, and it is because we see them for such a short time.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Arthur Herbert): It is so late, and you have heard so many speeches, I can only say a very few words. There is one thing that strikes me as rather an anomaly in the lecture, although the greater part of it I agree with entirely. It is stated on the one hand that the Reservists have caused enlisting to be disliked, and on the other hand it is said that the number of men who offered their services as soldiers in 1886 was actually as many as 75,000, a much larger number than ever offered themselves before. There may be some explanation of this; but I cannot say that I quite understand the two statements. That the soldier is better off than the civilian of the same class, there can be no doubt. I take a great deal of interest in the employment of Reserve soldiers, and whilst attending the Committees, I constantly have before me men who wish to obtain situations. The other day a fine young man, for whom a situation as goods porter on the Great Northern Railway had been found, told us that on his wages, 15*s.* a week, he was not nearly as well off as when in the ranks; that for board and lodging he had to pay 14*s.*, leaving only 1*s.* a week. He said, "If it was not for my Reserve pay I could not have lived on that." The difficulty we find in our Association is not so much in procuring situations for good, steady Reserve men as in finding the men qualified to take these places. Every week when I attend the Committee, four, five, or six men are brought up for whom we have obtained situations, and who have either left them or have been complained of. This is not the fault of the Government, or of the Association; this is the fault of the men. So long as men from the lowest class are enlisted, loafers who have never done a day's work, boys who have hung about public-houses, earning a shilling here and sixpence there, it cannot be expected that when these men return to civil life they will be able to find remunerative employment. No doubt they have improved in physique and in behaviour whilst under discipline, but they never liked work. They are, however, better off and have more chance of employment than before they enlisted. In some cases no doubt, the Reserve pay is a great bane. An employer of labour in London who has nearly 600 ex-soldiers in his employ, not all Reserve men, but men who have served in the Army, told me that one of his great difficulties was with the Reserve men, because they earned fair wages, which they gave to their wives and families, but when the Reserve pay came in, they considered it as a sort of pocket money to be spent in a lark, and they absented themselves from their work. He said that his foremen stated that they trusted he would not take any more Reserve men for the above-mentioned reason, though they do not object to men who have finished their time, and are often glad to get them. The fact of the money coming in suddenly once a quarter renders the men very apt to break out. I could go on for an hour and a half on this subject, but I am perfectly sure you are already tired; therefore I will now call upon Colonel Graves to answer any remarks that have been made by the gentlemen who have addressed you.

Colonel GRAVES, in reply: I am not here to-day, as it were, to argue the point with those who differ from me in what I have said. There are several suggestions put forward in the discussion which may or may not be better than the proposals

suggested by myself. I am not going to have it out here as to which are the best. The main point I had in my mind was to take, if I might say so, a large view of the matter, and to leave out the details, so as to raise the question from the wider view of the case (therefore including the less) so that one would extract during the discussion proposals which might be better possibly, and probably, than mine, so that there might be a general choice made, or a comparison instituted, from a greater number of suggestions being put forward. For instance, General Dashwood, in his remarks, spoke about enlistment being for seven, fourteen, and twenty-one years, with a deferred pension at the end of twenty-one years. Deferred pension and deferred pay should be, I presume, lumped together in a sum and distributed. General Dunno also suggested a permanent pension at the end of sixteen years.

General DUNNE: I suggested that it would require one.

Colonel GRAVES: I think myself a man who has come to twelve years' service, if he has a good character, ought to be allowed to go on for the twenty-one, and that would settle that question. Then came the question as to the profit of the canteen being a temporary measure. Quite true, as we have done with regard to the reduction of the grocery charge. If I get profits on the canteen only to go to the reduction of one halfpenny I reduce one halfpenny, if only one farthing I reduce one farthing, and so on. It is a matter which depends upon the depth of the canteen breeches pocket. There were some points brought out by General Dunno with regard to the employment of Reservists, as a general rule, in all Government offices and employments. I do not anticipate anything of the sort, and I should be very sorry if I left that to be understood. It is impossible that all appointments should be filled by Reservists; it would bring about a smash. But here I do want it very particularly to be understood that the British taxpayer is now paying a man for doing potman's work in a canteen while he thinks he is paying him for soldiering. They should not take a good dragoon, hussar, or infantryman and make a canteen potman of him. Again, we have our men taken away from duty for cooking purposes. I maintain, it is not the dragoon's business to put a bib and cap on and make puddings; it is his business to fight with the sword, and our Reservists should be put in to cook. The taxpayer in these cases is paying for men to cook when he thinks he is paying the soldier to fight.

General DUNNE: Having commanded a regiment sixteen years, I agreed *in toto* with every word you said. But I said it would mean extra pay. You would have to pay 10 per cent. more men in every regiment if you employed Reservists for the purposes of doing all these various duties.

Colonel GRAVES: My contention on that heading is this, that the taxpayer is already paying this man money for doing another person's job, and that the taxpayer should pay that 10 per cent. extra—if it be 10 per cent.—and fill these positions with men who are not supposed to be soldiers actually on full duty. Regiments should not be robbed of fighting men to supply grooms for remount depôts, for Sandhurst, and Woolwich, and as clerks, &c. Now the Government, I am glad to say, are doing something in the right direction. I have in my hand a letter from an Officer who is employed in the Royal Engineers Office, in London, and I am glad to find they are employing for the pulling down of barracks in the Home District 80 per cent. of old soldiers under the Engineer Department, and Reservists. They are employing unskilled labour in demolishing Regent's Park Barracks. I did not, I confess, quite clearly understand the alternative Reserve system that Captain Pearce put forward, but, at the same time, I am thankful it will appear in the Journal, and the readers of that publication will be able to judge between the two schemes. With regard to what Colonel Whittington said as to vested interests, I would go a little further, and add to what he has said, and I would give those who have vested interests in the ranks, option as to whether they will have deferred pay, as he suggests, or have it at 8d. a day. I am not bound to explain the paradox our gallant Chairman has put before me; I simply take the facts as I find them, and do not profess to be able to explain the cause of the large increase in offers for soldiering, further than to say we require three times as many as formerly, and to again refer to the congestion of population in industrial districts. With regard to soldiers owning their clothing and being in danger of selling it to civilians, and of having tramps going about the country

dressed up half hussars and half marines, I would put it in this way: no soldier ought to be allowed to sell his clothing to a civilian, and, on the part of the civilian, it ought to be made a misdemeanour to be in possession of any military clothing. When the clothing is worn out it should be sold into the Quartermaster's store, simply for its weight value as rags, to go to the paper mill. With regard to the question of the Reserve pay, which has been raised by one of the speakers, I would remind you that a very large number of them are having extra pay now at this moment, because there are a great many of them already on the poor rate. The British taxpayer is already, against his will, increasing the Reserve pay, I maintain in an improper manner, and in a way that is wasteful to the country, and what I want to do is to prevent that involuntary payment by increasing the men's Reserve pay. I thank you very much for the kind attention you have given me, and hope the discussion here to-day will produce effect in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to tender to Colonel Graves our unanimous and sincere thanks for the very interesting lecture we have just heard. I do not entirely agree with some things that he has said, yet I think the lecture will be most useful. Colonel Graves has thoroughly studied his subject, and has brought forward many proposals which I dare say will be considered by the official Committee about to assemble.

NOTE.

The numerous points to be touched upon, and the limited time at my disposal wherein to cover the great extent of ground involved in the subject of the foregoing paper, almost of necessity forced me to omit some facts and suggestions which might be thought useful.

I therefore add the following:—

I stated, in my reply to remarks made in the discussion, that I believed that many Reserve men are now actually in receipt of help over and above their Reserve pay, owing to their coming frequently on the poor rates, and receiving relief. Many more are little better than professional beggars tramping the country.

This can be tested very readily. Masters of Unions throughout the country should be called upon to furnish a Return quarterly for one year, showing the number of Reserve and discharged soldiers asking for relief. This Return should state relief given and cost per man, and would, I think, prove that many Reservists are now burdensome to the country in a way that is injurious to the man and to the Service generally.

With regard to the State's method of dealing with the pensioner and Reservist in matters of employment and payment for the same, the following piece of personal experience will speak for itself:—On the evening of the day on which I read the foregoing paper, I went to Brighton to examine the working of a soldiers' institute there, of which I am a trustee, and there met one of the Royal Engineers. He had cycled over from Portsmouth to spend a few days on pass. He informed me that his seven years' service was nearly up, and that he would pass to the Reserve. I asked him why he would not extend his service for pension, and he said "Oh! Sir, pension is no inducement now." I said, "Why?" He replied that both civilians and the Government expected a pensioner or Reservist to work for less wages than an ordinary civilian, and stated that a large number were employed on the Government works at Portsmouth, and that all pensioners having 1s. per day pension received but 13s. per week, where a civilian doing the same work received 17s., and so on in proportion. The truth of this man's statement can be easily tested.

I think it is reasonable to urge, especially in the face of recruiting difficulties, that the man's pension is remuneration for work done in the past, that the Reservist's pay is given him as a lien upon his services in case of national crises, and that in neither case should it be considered as part payment for labour in the present or future.

On the subject of the general ignorance which prevails among the industrial population concerning the actual condition and emoluments of the soldier while serving in the ranks, I would suggest that strong cardboards should be issued to all free libraries, mechanics' institutes, and soldiers' institutes, as well as to all post-offices in the Kingdom, setting forth in full the emoluments in money and in kind received by the soldier on one side, and a correct detail of all stoppages on the other, and showing at bottom the weekly average balance credit of "pocket money." These cards should set forth the soldier's prospects also. This part should be expressed in what is termed "popular language." A cardboard 12" x 12" would amply suffice.

There are a number of Societies now doing good work in registering Reserve and discharged soldiers for employment in civilian life; they have an uphill fight, and require increased support. I think their work would be very much helped were there a closer concordat and a freer intercommunication between them and the many soldiers' institutes now established and on the increase.

In the discussion, one speaker expressed disappointment that I had not formulated a far-reaching, drastic scheme, the adoption of which would have settled the whole of our difficulties. I admit, I have in measure thought out such a scheme, but I am bound to say I think it would have done more harm than good to have promulgated it. I don't think the country is ripe for a great change yet. I believe great changes must come; but I believe in "progress" rather than in "precipitation." If we can progress and improve our present system so as to overcome our recruiting difficulties, even for a time, then these changes may be postponed. I believe these changes must come eventually, owing to educational and economical tendencies now gaining ground and gathering force. But for the present I would simply say, in conclusion, "*Tout vient à qui sait attendre.*"—F. J. G.

3rd May, 1891.