

(ditto), 2nd paper, 3 hours. Fifth Day—Military history and geography, 1st paper, 3 hours; ditto, 2nd paper, 3 hours. Sixth Day—French, 3 hours; chemistry, 3 hours. Seventh Day—German, 3 hours; geology, 3 hours.

The examination in military history and geography will comprise the following subjects, as stated in G. O. 86 of 1874, viz.:

a. *The campaign of 1813 in the Peninsula.* Candidates will be expected to have a general knowledge of the geography of the country.

b. *The general principles of war.* Text Books: Jomini "L'art de la guerre"; Hanley "Operations of War."

There will be, in all cases, an interval of not less than one hour between the two periods of examination on each day.

No communication whatever will be allowed between the candidates at the examination.

General officers commanding at foreign stations will place no restrictions upon officers competing, further than the exigencies of the Service may absolutely require. It will be understood that a rule by which only one officer can be spared from a battalion at a time, for the purpose of studying at the staff college, does not apply to candidates from battalions which have officers now at the college, but whose course of study will terminate in December next.

Officers serving abroad who may be successful candidates, will be allowed passage home, on joining the staff college.

The names and examination numbers of the candidates who are successful in the competition, as well as of those who prove themselves qualified, but for whom there are no vacancies, and the examination numbers alone of candidates who fail, will be published immediately after the reports of the examiners have been received by the Director General of Military Education, with the total number of marks gained by each candidate, and his place on the list.

Candidates are recommended to obtain the reports of past examinations for admission, with copies of the examination papers, published by Messrs. Taylor and Francis, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, London.

THE late election contest in Great Britain has brought to light some curious facts connected with the manner in which the GLADSTONE administration has managed the affairs of the Empire. The following synopsis of a speech gives the best possible and least exaggerated epitome of the transactions under the late Imperial Government:—

"Sir James Elphinstone, in a second speech, in the Portland Hall, Scotland last Friday, said:—"A great feature of Mr. Gladstone's administration was Mr. Childers' reform of the navy. Mr. Childers came in for the purpose of creating a navy that was to dominate over the whole navies of Europe, and at the same time to be at half the cost of the present navy. Now, seeing that our ships cost about a quarter of a million a piece, I do not think that was a very possible transaction. The first thing they did to lighten the cost was to dispose of all the surplus stores in the dockyards, and the consequence was they ran the stores down to such a position that when the Channel Fleet came in here, there was no rope, twine, or anything else to fit them out. The whole stores were exhausted, the coal contracts were put into the hands of mercantile people, who supplied a description of coal called 'Baxter's mixture,' of which much the largest propor-

tion went out at the top of the funnel, and the smallest quantity was applied to the steam power of the ship, reducing the steam-power of the ships to such a rate that they could not keep clear of each other. And we are told that, under these circumstances, it might be possible to maintain the sovereignty of the seas! Mr. Gladstone not only did that but he reduced the pay and discharged large sections of public servants who had served the country with the greatest ability and fidelity for very many years. He discharged men from the dockyard in very large numbers, and turned them loose upon the population of this town, for maintenance out of the poor rate, and it was only when the most energetic appeals were made to him that he at last consented to convey the women to Canada, where they were acknowledged to be the best emigrants landed in that country for a very long time. But why should he export the best of our wealth from this country, which is our mechanical power, to a colony? It was but a very few months afterwards that a pressure arose, and these men had to be replaced by men from private yards, who did not understand the work of the public yards, because I submit to this meeting that the operations in connection with building a private ship are totally and entirely different from those for building a man-of-war. They resorted to extraordinary means to keep out of war-contrabition. Arbitration is a very good thing between two gentlemen, or two neighbours, or between private people if you can get a friend in a quiet way to become an arbitrator, but in our great national affairs I look upon it as a most mistaken mode of settling the question. As to the *Alabama* question, let it be understood that the Americans had no intention of fighting; it was simply a row in America for the purpose of keeping up their elections. They had no more intention of fighting at that time than I have of fighting anybody here. It was held out by the Government that we were in danger of war, but there was no more danger of war than of a free fight in this room. They went and altered our international law, which I endeavoured to read as a civilian all my life, with regard to seafaring matters. It was sufficiently complicated before, but they have made it more complicated now, and I defy anybody to understand how those five articles stand with regard to international law. They submitted our case to an arbitration of five arbitrators, chosen from countries who were perfectly ignorant of our municipal laws, our national character, and the whole idiosyncrasies of this country. It was submitted to an arbitration which was perfectly certain to decide against us, and which they were perfectly sure would be decided against us by making out a retrospective judgement. It has resulted in this, that we find our country men imprisoned and misused in different parts of the world without our even calling for redress. There was the crew of the *Deerhound*. I mention the *Deerhound* was pursuing a lawful occupation; she was transporting Mr. Bright's Birmingham muskets to the North of Spain. They were manufactured in Birmingham and going to be discharged at a Spanish port. There was no blockade of any sort, and, according to the old laws, the ship was perfectly entitled to land her cargo. She was taken, and her crew confined in a loathsome Spanish dungeon for two months. There was no man of war on the north coast of Spain, and Lord Granville never asked where they were, or anything about them. What became of those unfortunate fellows shot in St. Santiago de Cuba? They were shot under the most ambiguous state of

international law, and have we called upon the Spanish Government to give redress for the murder? We have done nothing of the kind. The fact is, that under Mr. Gladstone's Government a British subject may be murdered in any part of the world without the slightest redress or notice being taken of it."

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS TO THE THRONE.

London, March 19.—In the House of Lords the address, in reply to the speech from the Throne, was moved by the Marquis of Lothian, and seconded by the Earl of Cadogan. An interesting political debate followed. The Duke of Somerset, Liberal, made a sharp attack on Gladstone for listening to, if not encouraging, the parties who favoured the dismemberment of the Empire.

Earl Grey, another Liberal, described the dissolution as an act of political suicide committed during a temporary fit of insanity.

Lord Selbourne, late Lord High Chancellor, came to the defence of Gladstone with a brief but eloquent vindication of his course.

The Earl of Derby, the new Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the course of some non-committal remarks on England's policy abroad, intimated that the marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh with the Princess Marie Alexandrovna was a matter of political importance.

In the Commons there was a very full attendance, and the galleries were crowded with spectators.

Mr. Disraeli, on entering the Chamber was received with triumphant cheers by his supporters. When the members had returned from the Chamber of Peers, the Speaker read a letter from Lord Chief Justice Cockburne, informing the House of the circumstances under which one of the members, Mr. Whalley, was adjudged guilty and fined for contempt of Court.

Mr. Anderson gave notice that on the 31st inst. he would call attention to the fact that British subjects had not yet received compensation for their losses in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Washington.

An address in response to the Queen's speech similar to that introduced in the Upper House was moved by Sir William Stirling Maxwell, and seconded by Mr. Callender.

Mr. Torrens moved an amendment to the address, declaring Parliament to be conscious of its obligations to special care for India, and assuring Her Majesty of the interest and anxiety with which it will consider measures to alleviate the distress in that country and to prevent its recurrence.

Mr. Gladstone rose and said he would not seek to place any obstacle in the way of the Government in its treatment of India. He deprecated the appointment of a commission to enquire into the relations of employers and employed, and concluded by promising to give the new Government a fair trial.

Mr. Disraeli objected to the amendment moved by Mr. Torrens as inopportune, and it was withdrawn.

The Address was adopted, and the House adjourned.