

we may reasonably conclude that the proposed 50 ton gun would destroy the heaviest armor that it would be possible to place upon an ironclad, and the question of the utility of any armor becomes an important one.

MONSTER artillery appears to have reached its culminating point when a gun throwing 1,030lb. shot was produced. It appears, however, possible to exceed even that tremendous weight of projectile, and the question which arises is of what possible advantage will it be to do so. If accurate precision in range and the power of vision had increased in proportion to the calibre of the gun and the weight of projectile, then this fearful weight of metal would be valuable as it would prevent the approach of any hostile machine within its absolute range—no structure ever yet raised by man being capable of resisting the impact of its projectile. As, however, the deviation is not an exactly known quantity, and as the eye of the artilleryman aided by the most powerful telescope cannot make "the largest ironclad floating battery an available mark at three miles range, and as the case is exactly reversed the monster gun and its crew affording a safe and stationary object to the gunners on board the ironclad, there does not appear to be any great advantage gained by the increase in size, but on the contrary, considerable danger; inasmuch as it is not easy for a gunner to hit a moving object while the moving object will hit the stationary target to a certainty. Any expert in artillery well know how easily the *Devastation* for instance with twenty-five ton guns could pound such a monster to pieces with comparative little risk to herself, while every one of her shots would be sure to inflict damage on her opponent or its surroundings. Beyond the power of piercing the heaviest armor afloat, which may be taken at fifteen inches of iron, monster artillery is of no use; it never can be used in siege operations and as a garrison gun it will be more ornamental than useful. Our German friends are increasing their stock of these monsters on the principle of the celebrated regiment of Potsdam Grenadiers because they are too large to be useful; that they are likely to be inefficient is acknowledged by their originators and it would seem that their whole excellence is that they will pierce the thickest armor if they chance to hit it at a favorable range, to keep outside of which will be the tactics adopted by their assailants. Altogether it reminds us of the Irish duelist whose killing distance was twelve paces but who got killed by being put up at fifteen.

"The *Ostsee Zeitung* says that the German Ministry of War has ordered of the firm of Krupp a 37 centimetre coil gun, which will be made of the block of cast steel, weighing 52,500 kilogrammes, which attracted so much notice at the Vienna Exhibition. This new gun will be of the same calibre as the Krupp 1000-pounder at the last Paris Exhibition, but it will be very much stronger

than that gun, and will bear more than double the charge of powder. Hitherto the heaviest gun in the German navy was 24-centimetre gun built for the *König Wilhelm*; none of the other ships have guns of greater calibre than 21-centimetres. The new frigates *Preussen*, *Grosser Kurfürst*, and *Friedrich der Grosse* are, however, to be provided with 26 centimetre guns, and the two frigates now being built in London probably with 28 centimetre guns. The latter (with the exception of the 1000-pounder above mentioned which is now at Kiel) are heaviest guns used in the defence of the German coasts. The *Ostsee Zeitung* points out that these guns, though useful in close combat, would be totally incapable of protecting a seaport against the bombardment by such ships as the Russian *Peter the Great* or the English *Fury* and *Devastation*, as they are unable to pierce a plate of from twelve to fourteen inches at a distance of from 1000 to 1500 metres. The new 37 centimetre gun, on the other hand, can pierce 15 inch plate at a distance of 2000 metres."

We commend to our readers a careful perusal of the concluding portion of a lecture entitled "The Lessons of the Franco-Prussian War" by Captain Howe, R.E., which we republish in this issue, for the lesson it contains relative to the peculiar plan the auxiliary forces of the Crown holds in the British military system, which latter there is strong grounds for believing is not in a much better state of organization than that unlucky French army cursed with the double misfortunes of inefficiency and indiscipline facing with undaunted courage, a well appointed foe in front and assailed by rascally traitors in rear.

Notwithstanding the fact that all the misfortunes of that army has been made to point a moral and adorn a tale, it has as yet appeared to bring no warning or incentive to action to the people most intimately concerned in being always in a state of preparation, inasmuch as they have most to lose. For ourselves while we may profit by the blunders there is no reason why we should copy the vicious system inaugurated in England to prevent a similar catastrophe.

We reprint two articles from *Broad Arrow* of 14th March, one on the "Expediency of Short Service," in which that fallacy is recommended as a panacea for the evils afflicting the British Army. The other is styled "The Black Book of the Admiralty," and is valuable as to pointing to the origin of one naval law as well as our municipal institutes.

"It is asserted that the slowness of our steam vessels of war is mainly due to the size of their spars and riggings. A very simple way of proving or disproving this statement, or of ascertaining how much speed is lost through the vessels being heavily sparred, would be, as one of our correspondents suggests, to order several of the vessels to develop their greatest speed with all their spars taut, and under different conditions of wind and wave—and then to test their speed

under like circumstances, with the yards and spars sent down on deck, and the ships stripped to their lower masts.

"In the opinion of our correspondent, all the steam engines now on board our ships will have to be consigned to the scrap heap, before any great speed can be obtained from the acknowledged fine hulls of our ships of war. We agree with the correspondent that the slow speed of our vessels is due to inefficient steam machinery, and not to 'heavy spars and rigging.'"

The above paragraph taken from the *Army and Navy Journal* does not hit the true secret of the cause of slow speed, it is the result of defective engine power and faulty construction in the vessels themselves, the lines are faultiest, but the hulls are wretchedly built and therefore cannot be driven through the water without serious danger. Recent experiments should tell our contemporary that the United States Navy as a general rule is not constructed as it ought to have been, they are merely contractors' hulls.

A correspondent of the "Father of Lies" (the *N. Y. Herald*) furnishes that veracious sheet with the following story, which, although of course a pure invention, is good in its way.

It is a pity that the effect of clever "get-ups" by Americans is so frequently marred by some blunder in names or titles. It is to be supposed that every one knows the family names of the Argyll peerage to be Campbell, but that is of no consequence to an American, who puts it down Gordon, probably by reason of some association in his own mind, on some such principle of reasoning as that which leads the same ingenious folk to almost invariably write Normandy for Normanby. For, says the smart American, who think his common school smattering of education all-sufficient, "Every body knows that Normandy is a Province of France, but whoever heard of such a name as 'Normanby'? those Britishishers don't know what they are writing!"

However, here is the story:—

"Here is a good story which has not yet found its way into print, but for the truth of which I can vouch. Lord George Gordon, a young man of four and twenty, wishing to marry a certain young lady, went quite recently to ask the permission of his father, the duke of Argyll. The duke, a pompous little man, replied in effect: "My son, since our house has been honored by being united to the royal family I have thought it right to delegate a decision on all such matters to your elder brother, the Marquis of Lorne. Go, therefore, and consult him. The Marquis of Lorne on being applied to said, "My dear brother, in a case of importance like this I should think it right to ask the decision of the Queen, the head of the royal family into which I have married." The Queen, on the matter being laid before her, declared that since her terrible bereavement she had been in the habit of taking no steps without consulting the Duke of Saxo-Cobourg, the brother of her deceased husband. To the Duke, then, the case was referred and from him a letter was received