

the merchant sailor to submit himself to strict discipline and sober privations. And this powerful inducement we shall be unable to offer so long as we allow our enemy to send his goods unmolested across the seas because a neutral flag covers his merchandise. On all these grounds, therefore, it will be well for us, ere we find ourselves involved in hostilities, to abrogate the Declaration of Paris, a declaration never legally binding because never ratified. An enemy will beware, how he offends us when he sees that we are resolved to avail ourselves to the utmost of our maritime strength."

We have to thank T. D. SULLIVAN, Esq., Assistant Secretary and Librarian of the "Royal United Service Institution," for a copy of the very valuable lecture, entitled "Another Warning Voice from 1805," by Major General T. B. COLLINSON, R. E., with whose "Warning Voice from the Spanish Armada," our readers are familiar.

It is not our intention to review this lecture for the reason that as an historical illustration of a very exciting crisis in the history of the British race, as well as an exposition of folly of subjecting the Military and Naval Institutions of the Empire to the caprice of mere party exigencies, and the danger of allowing parliamentary intermeddling therewith, the lecture would be sure to suffer in the operation—we, therefore, commence its publication in another page for the benefit of our readers, who will be better able to appreciate the drift of the gallant lecturer's argument from the unmutated document.

We have frequently had occasion to place before our would be army reformers, the evils of the "ballot," or conscription, and how heavily such a course would tell on the poor man—a lecture delivered by an officer of the Royal Engineers, before the Royal United Service Institution on 30th March, sets this question at rest, and shows that the Service must compete with the labor market if the State wants soldiers.

"Captain J. C. Ardagh, R.E., read a paper at the United Service Institution on the 30th ult., on "The comparative cost of the armies of different nations, and the loss to a country by conscription." The chair was occupied by Lieutenant General Sir Lintorn Simmons, K.C.B. (Inspector General of Fortifications), who was accompanied by the Prince Imperial.

"The Lecturer said that, on considering the comparative cost of different armies, the first question to decide as a preliminary step to the investigation, was the standard of comparison, and here at the outset was to be encountered a difficulty. No two countries kept their budget accounts on the same system, and none gave complete information regarding the cost of their army in an accessible form. However, from reliable statistics obtained, Captain Ardagh said that he could, by dividing the army estimates of different countries by the population, state with tolerable accuracy the cost of the army per head of population. America stood at 4s. per head, but this small amount was simply accounted for by the insignificant force maintained by that country. Russia, Austria, and Italy stood at 6s. per head, England and Germany at 2s., and France headed the list

with 11s. per head, which excess was mainly due to the reorganisation. The proportion of revenue spent on the army varied in different countries from 13 per cent. in Italy to 21 per cent. in Germany. The average number under arms differed between exceedingly wide limits, for while America had only 24,000, Russia had 675,000 men. In France there was one man under arms for every 82 persons of population, in Germany one in 98, Italy one in 124, Russia one in 127, and Austria one in 150. England followed with one in 212, but if the 63,000 regular troops employed in India were reckoned we had one man under arms for every 143 persons of population, or much the same number as Austria. The American proportion was only one 1,500. Then with regard to the cost per head of the average force under arms in time of peace, the lowest cost appeared in Russia and Italy, at £37 and £8 per man. Three great European Powers were at substantially the same amount—France standing at £43 and Germany and Austria each £45. In England the amount was more than double, it being £93 per head, while in America it rose to the enormous figure of £278 per man. It was strikingly apparent that when every allowance had been made for the coarseness of the necessities and the luxuries of life in England and the United States, the forces raised in those countries by voluntary enlistment were more expensive by far—judging by the estimates—than the armies of conscripts raised by the great European Powers; and the conclusion was that if the remuneration offered to the Anglo-Saxon soldier in the open labor market was a fair one, that which the conscripts were compelled to accept was inadequate, and the balance which was withheld from them, although it did not appear on any budget or estimate, was a virtual tax on the country. About one-thirtieth of the population was about the maximum force which the great military Powers could place under arms in time of war, while we had in England and the colonies (except India) 331,000 available men, or one in 96 of the population of the United Kingdom. In making a comparison it was seen that voluntary recruiting was apparently expensive for America and England paid very much more for their rank and file than the countries where universal liability to military service was in force. But the economy of conscription was not real, for if a soldier was worth £40 per annum in the open market and only £20 was given to him, he was consequently robbed of his time and labor to the extent of the £20 withheld, and an additional tax was imposed on the State by the exaction of that annual sum from every soldier employed, instead of this being distributed over the population generally by an equitable system of taxation. The money loss to a country by the system of conscription was enormous, but no pecuniary expression could represent the full amount of individual suffering and public inconvenience which resulted from so extensive and violent a dislocation of the labor market. Conscription viewed in any aspect was a costly injustice, and the fewer the men required in proportion to those liable the greater was the unfairness to the unfortunate who were drawn. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, in the course of which Lord Waverley offered some interesting statistics with regard to the condition of the Italian army. General Sir W. Codrington said that with regard to conscription he considered that it was the most expensive and unjust system that could be adopted by any nation, and not only was the conscript himself kept in view, but his family was made answerable for the man being forthcoming

in his village when he was wanted for his term of military service. Such a practice could never be carried out in England, and it would be found preferable to pay a large amount to men who voluntarily enlisted rather than compel them to join the service as conscripts. The proceedings concluded with a vote of thanks to Captain Ardagh for the paper he had contributed."

The following notice of a novelty in Artillery construction is taken from *Broad Arrow* of 8th April.

If the arrangement described can ram a shot home, it will cause a revolution in artillery, and be particularly applicable to the monster guns.

"A muzzle-loading gun, in which the manipulation required for the operation of loading, shall be carried out and through the breech, is certainly a paradox, and yet such is the essential feature of an invention about to be applied experimentally by the American Government to a "15" Rodman gun. When the gun is to be loaded, a small platform rises up in front of the muzzle, bearing a truck, on which are placed the projectile, cartridge, and wad. The cartridge is forced by a hole running lengthways through it, and there is also an aperture in the wad and in the base of the projectile. In the breech of the gun there is a corresponding hole. Through this the rammer is entered from the rear, is pushed up the bore of the gun, through the wad in the wad and cartridge, the head of the staff being formed so that by a slight turn it attaches itself firmly to the projectile. The rammer being then withdrawn, drags after it into the chamber of the piece the projectile cartridge and wad. The aperture in the breech, only made of sufficient size to admit the staff, is then closed by a screw. The advantages claimed for the invention are: economy of time—since, as the elevation of the piece need not be altered for loading, the operations of charging and laying the gun may be carried on simultaneously,—security from the danger incurred by the premature explosion of the charge, and also diminished exposure of the men engaged in loading."

In another page will be found a solution of an historical problem of some interest, the reason "Why LINCOLN was assassinated" was always a puzzle—till this article appeared—and while letting in a flood of light on the savage judicial murders that closed the war between North and South, exhibits the Siege of Auburn as a blood-thirsty vulgar tyrant.

The man who could send a "prisoner to Fort Lafayette by pulling our bell cord, and to the Dry Tortugas by pulling another," may be a very fit representation of a Free democracy, but liable to indulge his likings and dislikings without any regard to law or decency, in a manner far more befitting a fierce Roman Emperor than the servant of a free people. We now know the reason why SERRATT was not brought to trial and other little matters.

*Broad Arrow* of the 29th April, gives the following paragraph, by which it would appear that the English War Department was in earnest in the attempt to utilise the aux-