

countered by them, as by us, when war is justifiable. Such was the war with the South. It was absolutely necessary to preserve the United States from dismemberment, just as we should be compelled to war with any country that attempted to destroy the empire; in fact the very same sufficient grounds which drove the United States into a war with the South would necessitate our going to war were Canada invaded, knowing, moreover, that if one, and that the nearest and greatest of our colonies could be violently wrested from us it might not be long before England would lose others, and dwindle down into an inferior power. We do not believe the Americans would ever commit so great an outrage, not to say blunder, as to attempt the invasion of Canada. We believe property is as secure in Canada as it is in India. When, if ever, we lose Canada by force of arms we shall see Consols at 60 or 50. England will be no longer what she is.

But, in conclusion, let us observe that we never heard of any American of position threaten Canadian invasion, while we have heard strong declaimers on their (the Americans') part of any such intention. Acting on Wellington's advice that the best way to preserve peace is to be prepared for war, it may be well for the Canadians to erect fortifications and render all the able-bodied men amongst them accustomed to the use of the sword and the rifle, but to defend themselves against American invasion we doubt not they will never be wanted.

If, however, strengthening their means of defence is any advantage to Canada, have not the Canadians much to thank the Fenians for?

#### READY FOR WAR.

(From the London Times.)

As to men, we have more soldiers under arms in the United Kingdom than we ever had before in time of peace. As to arms, we not only have 300,000 Sniders in store, but we have in that weapon a rifle as far superior as the Chassepot is superior in the eyes of Frenchmen to the Prussian needle gun. Our artillery is excellent—in fact we have guns enough for 60,000 artillerymen. As for ammunition, we can make 1,500,000 projectiles for breech-loaders in one week, and in a few weeks we could manufacture the whole amount expended by the British army at the siege of Sebastopol. We have, according to Mr. Cardwell, adequate though not excessive stores, it being impolitic to keep in hand enormous quantities of stores, which are likely to spoil, and of which in these times of transition and reconstruction the very pattern may change and so render them useless. It is true that the seventy-five battalions of Infantry at home are weak and that the companies in each regiment are below their proper force; but the policy of the Government has been to keep the *cadres* always in existence, together with their officers and non-commissioned officers, ready for immediate expansion as soon as an emergency arises. The Government, in a word, take credit to themselves for not neglecting to maintain all things which it requires time to provide, while they have relied on the liberality of Parliament and on the unparalleled resources of the country to supply the army with such stores and necessities as do not require time for preparation. It was this conviction which en-

abled Mr. Cardwell to conclude both his speeches by declaring that if we were on the eve of war, we might truly say that England never ventured on a war, finding her resources in men and munition in a better state of preparation than at present.

While the Secretary of War is able to take so cheerful a view of our military resources, Mr. Childers is no less confident as to the efficient condition of our Navy. Whether we are to assume the attitude of a "secure" or of an "armed" neutrality—nay, even if we should be forced actually to take up arms by any contingency arising out of the Franco-Prussian war, we have, he says, at this moment a most efficient navy. We have seven ships in the Channel Fleet and nine in the reserve of that fleet; sixteen in all the coasts of the United Kingdom. Besides these we have a strong fleet in the Mediterranean, which in the course of this month will join the Channel Fleet and manœuvre with it. The combined fleet would be of itself more than a match for the combined forces of any two nations that could be brought against it. In addition, we have a considerable number of ships in reserve, which will all be commissioned in the present year. It cannot but be satisfactory to the public, and some consolation for the additional burdens this untoward outbreak of war will entail, to learn, while the French navy numbers 27 broadside and four special iron-clads, carrying 283 guns, the English have 40 iron-clads—ten of which are ships of the *Monarch* and *Captain* class—carrying 546 guns, each weighing seven tons and upwards. In a short time these 40 ships will be increased to 48, carrying 602 guns—a naval force which, it is not too much to say, could sweep the seas of all the navies in the world. With regard to stores, the navy, according to Mr. Childers, is well supplied. Our reserves are "in admirable condition," and our Coast-guard consists of men, "altogether fit for service." All that is wanted to render this efficient peace navy still more formidable, and to carry it one step further into a state of "secure neutrality," is the liberality of Parliament. But whether the House be liberal or not, Mr. Childers, as responsible for the present state of the navy, considers that, even as it is, it is "in a most satisfactory state."

#### WHAT OUR NAVY IS AND WHAT IT OUGHT TO BE.

(From the New York Herald.)

The Secretary of the Navy in his annual report recommends, as a nucleus for a navy, forty iron-clads or monitors, for coast defence; ten first-class armoured vessels, for foreign service; ten first class wooden steamships, each of three thousand tons; twenty second class steam sloops, of two thousand tons each; twenty third class steam-sloops, of one thousand tons, and fifty-five fourth class steam gunboats, averaging six hundred tons. This would make our effective navy one hundred and sixty vessels. One hundred and twenty of these vessels would be employed in foreign squadrons, one-half at a time, or an appropriation could be made annually for sixty vessels of full steam and sail power, the vessels for harbor defence to be laid up and cared for until they are wanted. This would not be a large navy for this country; on the contrary, it would be termed in England and France a small one.

Still, for want of a better it would suffice in these times of heavy taxation, and it would enable the naval authorities to send respectable squadrons abroad, and with the energetic cruising done by our officers we could manage to have our flag shown in places where it has not been seen for many years.

The current Navy Register presents an array of names of vessels, and to the uninitiated it would appear that we had a sufficient number of ships of war to meet the demands of our commerce. On close examination of the list, however, it would appear that many of the ponderous names borne on the register belong to vessels that can render no assistance either in peace or in war. There are at the present time forty one wooden vessels in commission, and four ironclads, making an effective force amount of forty-five vessels of all classes. In addition to these there are eleven vessels on the stocks that can be got ready in a year, seventeen steam vessels capable of being repaired, and fourteen ironclads that can be got ready for harbor defence in two weeks—in all, eighty seven vessels that can be made effective in time of war, although from this total should be deducted five sailing vessels. Of the remaining vessels borne on the register ninety eight are small tugs, fit only for dock yard duty, vessels employed in the transportation of stores, hulks, receiving ships, school ships, practice ships, and experimental vessels which have been proved to be worthless. So we have nearly one hundred vessels unfit for war purposes. This is an exhibit not gratifying to an American heart and it is these defects in our naval organization we wish to see remedied.

It will require something of an outlay to bring the number of vessels up to the standard required by the Secretary of the Navy report; but it must be remembered that this outlay will extend through several years—four or five at least; and even then we cannot hope to have the whole number required unless Congress appropriate from year to year the amount of money asked for. We would recommend that Congress begin the work at once, as it will take some time to collect the timber and shape the iron for our future war ships, so that at least a year will be lost in making preparations. We would also recommend that all the iron ships and all the engines built by contract at some of the private machine shops in this country, and that outside shipbuilders, be invited to offer plans for modelling and building some of the wooden steam vessels. This will inaugurate a zealous competition between our naval contractors and private shipbuilders. It will infuse new life into our dockyards and machine shops, and it will relieve the public mind, which will feel easy when Congress is seen taking some steps to place the navy in an efficient condition. Now, what member of the Senate or House of representatives will commence this work by offering the proper resolution? Who will take the opportunity that is offered to make himself a name with the American people?

The Mitrailuse adopted by the British Government, and now being manufactured for the army, is said to be a far more destructive weapon than that used by the French. At a trial of one of the guns at Shoeburyness recently at a target representing a body of 150 foot soldiers, at 800 yards, the Mitrailuse made 264 hits in four minutes, so that one hundred and fifty soldiers at that distance must have been completely annihilated.