

eral"—whatever that may be. In the Militia Act and our R. & O. it is laid down that the ranks shall be the same in our militia as in our army. There is no such rank as Surgeon General or Deputy Surgeon General in the army. No instructions are issued as to the duties of officers, the uniform they shall wear or the relative rank they are to hold. It will be curious to note the uniform and badges of rank these officers will appear in. It may seem strange to some that with two exceptions, these Deputy Surgeons-General are permanent corpsmen. But it only goes to illustrate what has long been notorious, that the militia is run as a political machine. Militia surgeons may be under the impression that long and good service will entitle them to this promotion, but they will find, as in this instance, that junior medical officers (one even not in the active militia at all) are promoted over their heads. We would like to know under what clause of the R. & O. these appointments are made, and if the holders thereof vacate their regimental appointments.

This E. O. appears to be made up of promotions and appointments as "special cases," Major Rutherford of the Royal Canadian Artillery, getting a brevet majority, as a special case. As this officer was promoted a captain only in 1893, it is rather quick promotion. Lieut.-Col. Wilson, of the Royal Canadian Artillery, has been transferred from the command of one of the Garrison Companies to "B" Battery, and this battery made into a separate unit. The establishment list makes the strength of this battery two subaltern officers, and as its strength is but 58 men, it would seem to be "loaded up" with officers. The artillery at Quebec should now be happy with two officers drawing "command pay," viz., Lieut.-Col. Montizambert and Lieut.-Col. Wilson. Majors Gordon and Vidal, commanding Infantry Companies of the R.R.C.I. have been made Brevet Lieut.-Colonels. When these officers were made Majors a couple of years ago, it was thought to be a great injustice to other militia captains commanding companies, but now that they have been made colonels the majors will also have just ground of complaint. It seems singular that Major Drury, commanding "A" Battery, and a splendid officer, should not have got this step also.

Major Donaldson of the Militia Department seems to be fortunate. When he entered the department he was a lieutenant. When the then Minister of Militia went out, he was promoted to be a captain, now when the Hon. Mr. Patterson goes out he

is made a major. No doubt when the Hon. Mr. Dickey retires, Major Donaldson will be made a lieutenant colonel.

Captain Williams, of the London Field Battery, is allowed to retire as a major, contrary to the R. & O., but as a "special case," and Captain and Paymaster Sutherland, of the "Oxford Rifles," is given the rank of major, also as a "special case." Lieut. Darcy MacMahon, of the R.R.C.I., is permitted to retire retaining rank, although not entitled to this distinction by the R. & O.

All these promotions by brevet in the permanent corps are made, apparently, for the purpose of making these officers outrank other militia officers of practically the same grade. Lieutenants are brevetted captains, captains majors and majors lieutenant-colonels. This is a gross injustice to other militia officers. Why should a captain of a permanent infantry company command officers who are in command of battalions, if these infantry captains happened to be the senior by brevet.

It is about time there was another board of visitors appointed for the Royal Military college. The regulations require a board to report every year. In nineteen years there have been three such reports. The board as at present constituted consists of three permanent militia officers and two others not actively connected with the force. Strange as it may seem no graduate of the college has ever been placed on the board. No man has ever been a member of this board who ever attended the college as a cadet or in any other capacity. What would the Hon. Mr. Dickey think, if the Board of Trustees of Toronto University (of which he is a graduate) did not contain a member who had ever been at the university? This is the position of the Military College. We do hope that he will deal with this matter without delay.

The Hon. Mr. Patterson in his speech at Montreal, claimed credit for the large number of militiamen who obtained certificates at the schools in 1894. It should be remembered that some 140 of these were attached at the Levis camp, which camp cost some \$27,000.00. A number of others were N. C. O.'s and men of the permanent corps.

Some time ago the papers stated that the superintendent of the Quebec cartridge factory was returning from England with a lot of new machinery for the cartridge factory,

Quebec. We would like to know what kind of ammunition this machinery is intended to make. Surely the government have not purchased machinery to make cartridges for the condemned Lee-Metford rifle, and if not, for what rifle is the machinery? With a new rifle still undecided on, it would seem to be a waste of money to purchase machinery that may be useless when the new rifle is decided on.

### The Chinese Naval Losses.

By the Naval correspondent of the Sunday Gazette, London.

The following statement, which I believe to be accurate, of the Chinese vessels of war destroyed or taken by the Japanese since the beginning of the campaign may be of general interest:—

1. Tsan Cheng, paddle despatch vessel, taken off Asan, July 25th, 1894.
2. Kwang Yi, torpedo cruiser, run ashore, after the battle of Asan, July 25th, 1894, and destroyed by the Japanese.
3. King Yuen, belted barbette cruiser, sunk on September 17th, 1894, during the battle of Hai-yun-Tau.
4. Chih Yuen, protected cruiser, sunk on September 17th, 1894, during the battle of Hai-yun-Tau.
5. Chao Yung, protected cruiser, rammed and sunk by her consort, the Tsi Yuen, while endeavouring to escape from the battle of Hai-yun-Tau.
6. Yang Wei, cruiser, run ashore to avoid sinking at the battle of Hai-yun-Tau.
7. Kwang Chin, cruiser, ran away at the battle of Hai-yun-Tau, went ashore, and was destroyed by the Japanese on September 23rd, 1894.
8. A torpedo-boat, taken at the fall of Port Arthur, November 21st, 1894.
9. Ting Yuen, battleship, torpedoed at Wei-hai-wei, February 4th, 1895.
10. Lai Yuen, belted barbette cruiser, torpedoed at Wei-hai-wei, February 5th, 1895.
11. Wei Yuen, training ship, torpedoed at Wei-hai-wei, February 5th, 1895.
12. Twelve torpedo-boats sunk while attempting to escape from Wei-hai-wei.
13. Ching Yuen, protected cruiser, sunk by gun-fire at Wei-hai-wei, February 9th, 1895.
14. Chen Yuen, battleship, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
15. Tsi Yuen, turret ram, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
16. Ping Yuen, coast defence ironclad, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
17. Kwnang Ping, torpedo-cruiser, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
18. Chen Pien, gunboat, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
19. Chen Pei, gunboat, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
20. Chen Chung, gunboat, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
21. Chen Nan, gunboat, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
22. Chen Tung, gunboat, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.
23. Chen Hsi, gunboat, surrendered at Wei-hai-wei, February 13th, 1895.

Of the above, Nos. 1, 2 and 15 were the three vessels engaged in the action off Asan; and Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 were the twelve vessels engaged in the battle of Hai-yun-Tau; so that none of the craft employed in those engagements remain in Chinese hands. The total bill of losses is twenty-two ships destroyed and twelve ships captured. On the other hand, the Japanese seem to have lost but one gunvessel (doubtful) and one torpedo-boat in the course of the operations. The estimated value of the Chinese ships, with their armaments, taken or destroyed, is £2,315,000.