

MAJOR GENERAL SELBY SMITH and Staff, left Ottawa on Wednesday last, on his tour of Brigade Camp inspection in the Province of Ontario. The first Camp to be visited was Cobourg, which he inspected on Thursday, the Kingston Camp on Friday, and the Brockville Camp on Saturday last. This week he will inspect the Holland Landing Camp, to-day (Tuesday), and the Guelph Camp on Thursday; after which he proceeds on his over land journey through the North West Territory to British Columbia. He will leave Sarnia for Duluth and Fort Garry on the 2nd July, and Fort Garry for Victoria, B. C., on the 12th July, proceeding via Fort McLeod and the Kootenay pass through the Rocky Mountains. The transport through the North West Territories will be supplied by the Police force. We wish the General and party a pleasant and prosperous journey and a safe return to Ottawa.

On Saturday, the 19th inst., a Rifle Match took place at the Rideau Rifle Range between five members of the Ottawa Rifle Club. Shooting with the steel-barrel Snider, and five using the common iron-barrel Snider, to test the relative merits of the two arms; and if we are to judge by the results the common Snider has it—taking for granted that they were equally matched in skill.

IRON BARRELS.

	20 yds.	30 yds.	40 yds.	Total
Throop	22	19	29	70
Roardon	25	22	14	61
Grey	18	24	18	60
Cotton	25	22	11	58
Symes	13	23	14	50
Total				299

STEEL BARRELS.

	20 yds.	30 yds.	40 yds.	Total
O'Gruburn	21	28	12	61
Sutherland	22	22	15	59
McPherson	20	13	24	57
Todd	20	18	17	55
K Gruburn	14	20	20	54
Total				286

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for individual expressions of opinion in communications addressed to the VOLUNTEER REVIEW.

To the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW.

Sir,—On Friday last, I saw two Quebec members of this year's Wimbledon Team in Montreal, they were waiting orders to proceed to Quebec to report to the officer in charge.

I find there were men at Quebec from another Province waiting for a chance to go. By dint of repeated telegrams these men obtained orders to start, and were on board the steamer on Saturday, much to the disappointment of some.

Query,—Why were the Quebec men not notified like other members, was it desired to leave Quebec without proper representatives again?

Montreal, 21th June.

S.

To the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW.

Sir,—In your issue of 27th April, you have inserted an article from the *New York Army and Navy Journal*, on that portion of my memoir of the military services of Sir Garnet Wolseley, dealing with his visit to the head quarters of Generals Lee and Jackson, and I trust you will in fairness also give circulation to the enclosed letter, a copy of which I addressed to the Editor of your American contemporary, and which he inserted in the number of his journal for the 1st May. With regard to your comments founded on the article to which I have taken exception, I would merely ask to whom the derisive term *horse marine* is applied? It cannot refer to Sir Garnet Wolseley, and I conclude must be intended for me; should it be so, it is a taunt without either wit or point to recommend it. As an officer who has served his country (I trust with credit to himself) for 10 years in such climates as China, the Red Sea, Persian Gulf, and the Zanzibar Coast, and whose father and grandfather, 6 uncles and brothers, have served in the Indian or Royal Armies during the past and present century; I think I can afford to pass over such amenities of literature with the observation that their employment can never advance an argument, but must recoil on the head of the person who uses them.

I trust that with the fair dealing that has characterized your *New York contemporary*, you will give insertion to this letter and the enclosed, and I beg to sign myself,

Yours faithfully,

C. R. Low, Lieutenant.

late of Her Majesty's Indian Navy.
London, 25th May, 1875.

To the Editor of the *Army and Navy Journal*.

Sir,—I have just had my attention drawn to the article in your impression of March 20, criticizing that portion of my memoir of the services of Sir Garnet Wolseley, dealing with his visit to the head quarters of Generals Lee and Jackson, and his opinion of those leaders. As I believe that fair play is a quality on which Americans pride themselves equally with us Britishers, I trust you will give me the necessary space in your columns to reply to your strictures. In the first place, it is evident that you have not perused the chapter of my memoirs which you criticize, but that your knowledge of its contents is derived from an article in the *New York World*, which I am pleased to see is of a favourable character. Passing over your statement that I am very proud of my memoir of Sir Garnet Wolseley, (though how you became possessed of this knowledge I know not), I would observe that had you taken the trouble to glance at the work in question before criticizing its contents, you would have seen that Wolseley in 1862, was not "Military Secretary or something of the kind in Canada," but was Assistant Qr Mr. General.

Accuracy on such points, I should have thought, essential in a high class military journal. Your misstatements further on are, however, of far greater importance. You say, speaking of the impressions Sir Garnet Wolseley brought away with him from his visit to General Lee's head quarters, "The only trouble was that he rashly confided in Mr. Low, or that Mr. Low elicited opinions

and statements from him, which no cool and unbiased critic would pronounce, and that Mr. Low has paraded these statements and opinions to the world as coming from Sir Garnet Wolseley, while the *World*—*New York Journal* of that name—has very gravely printed them as authentic and weighty utterances. If Sir Garnet Wolseley ever did say what Mr. Low asserts, and which we print elsewhere, the probability is that he so spoke after dinner. There is a positive warmth in his opinions and statements, a rosy coloring and gilded exaggeration, that are very common in post-prandial conversations over the Madeira and under the blue clouds from Aromatic Portagas. There are few men, however clear-headed, who will not at such times 'talk wild,' but it is hardly fair to report such conversations verbatim, and gravely retail them to the world as the deliberate opinions of the speaker."

I will leave it to your readers candidly to judge who is "talking wild."—Sir Garnet Wolseley, you, or me, when I inform you that the utterances and opinions of Sir Garnet referred to above, were written and published in *Blackwood's Magazine* for January, 1863, directly after his return from his visit down South. Whatever may be your reviewer's experiences of "post prandial conversations over the Madeira and under the blue clouds from Aromatic Portagas," those who know Sir Garnet Wolseley's abstemious habits, will smile at the inference that anything emanating from him was said or written under such influences. Sir Garnet more than once talked over his article in *Blackwood* with me, but the "rosy columns of gilded exaggeration," to which you eloquently allude as marking his opinions and statements, was certainly not due to the surroundings or concomitants of our conversations, which were held within the sternly prosaic walls of the War Office. On these occasions he more than once spoke of General Lee in the terms that have offended you so highly, and he has seen these statements in print and approved of them as emanating from him and as his deliberate opinion.

Further on in your article you mix up in the most perplexing manner Sir Garnet Wolseley's views, and those of the *New York World* and the "military critics" referred to by that journal. You say: "The assertions paraded as coming from Sir Garnet, and attributed to 'military critics,' that Lee was the greatest General the world has seen since Napoleon; that the Army of the Potomac would have marched to Washington, and proclaimed McClellan dictator had not Lincoln given him the Maryland command; that the little Ashantee campaign against a crowd of naked savages, was equal to Wellington's campaign of 1814; the clashing of Raglan at Sebastopol, Napier at Magdala, and Wolseley at Coomassie with the Iron Duke at Paris, after his long and arduous campaigns; all these assertions and comparisons are so infelicitously stilted and exaggerated, that the after dinner inference is irresistible if we accept them as coming from Sir Garnet or any other *bona fide* military critic."

I need not say that neither Sir Garnet nor I committed the absurdity of comparing the Ashantee campaign with Wellington's in 1814; neither for the matter of that does the *New York World*, as I read their comments in the above extracts. All Sir Garnet Wolseley is responsible for are his views as to General Lee's generalship, and the temper of the army of the Potomac shortly before Antietam. On these points, which may be found treated in full in the extracts from *Blackwood*, he spoke the opinions of an un-