behaved with conspicuous gallantry throughout the engagement and had been recommended for the Victoria Cross, a decoration which his distinguished father gained in 1858."

A few words with regard to the purely professional part of the work of army surgeons.

The great bulk of the operating comes upon them with a rush. In quick succession wounded men are brought in from all sides, many of them needing immediate attention. No civil surgeon ever requires to use his judgment so promptly, decide so rapidly and act so quickly as the army surgeon and this too at high pressure. One case follows another perhaps for several successive hours until the surgeons are utterly exhausted. To save a life with or without the limb must be decided in a moment; what needs flash through the surgeon's mind; the precise nature of the wound; the man's physical condition; without amputation can he be removed with safety; how far it will be necessary for him to be transported before he reaches a safe, wholesome and comfortable resting place; what will be his sanitary surroundings and the attention it will be possible to give him there; the climatic conditions and what foods, stimulants and medical comforts are obtainable as he passes on to the rear.

In the present campaign the casualties, though large enough, have not equalled those of many former campaigns. It was thought that with magazine rifles, rapid firing guns and other modern improvements in firearms the destruction to life would be something appaling, Fortunately so far it has not been so.

At Blenheim, 1704, the British lost	23 per cent.
At Kunnersdorf, 1759, the Prussians lost	65 per cent.
At Talavera, 1809, the British lost	24 per cent.
At Albuera, 1809, the British lost.	52 per cent.
In the Crimean War, 1854, the British lost	15 per cent.
At Gettysburg, 1863 { Unionists lost	20 per cent.
At Gettysourg, 1805 (Confederates lost	46 per cent.
In the Franco-German War, 1870, the while German Army	•
lost	13 per cent.
	-

Some regiments have suffered severely, especially those engaged in the heroic relief of Ladysmith, but the percentage of los-es on the whole is not so great as those quoted above.

At Paardeberg the other day, the Canadian loss was nearly 3 per cent. killed and about 7 per cent. wounded, *i. e.*, their casualties were less than 10 per cent. The Canadian loss appeals to us and we say in all conscience it was large enough. This is true, but I make the comparison to impress ourselves with the happy fact that modern inventions and improvements so far are not tending towards a much greater destruction of life. And why? In the first place, tactics have changed and are changing immensely since the days of "the thin red line." And again, the use of firearms of greater precision, longer range and a wider dangerous zone has of necessity produced a bullet of small calibre. Amongst