

other has to fight against these, and likewise against an ignorance which he has no means of removing save by slow experience. The one starts, almost the equal of a veteran in his shooting, and must, *ceteris paribus*, soon obtain a great moral ascendancy over the other, which increases with every battle gained in a campaign.

Considered in this light, the physical and moral advantages of target practice can only be obtained by the fullest extension of its benefits to all sections of the country, and especially to the rank and file of the military forces, regular and volunteer. The interstate and international matches are only valuable in so far as they tend to popularise practice with the rifle, and make it the national weapon, as the longbow was once the weapon of the English yeoman. Short range matches with practical military rifles, and matches in which the largest average of respectable shooting is the test rather than the high training of a "team" of crack marksmen, these are the really valuable features of rifle practice for military purposes. The team practice and long range shooting have this special value, that they encourage perfection in the short range practice, by reason of emulation. It is in the military matches open to the largest number that the greatest benefit is found. The Editor of the *Journal* was impressed with this fact when he threw open the *Army and Navy Journal* prize at Creedmoor, for yearly competition by any company in the United States, regular or militia, including the Marine Corps. Hitherto it has been competed for only at Creedmoor, and almost entirely by New York troops. Some New Jersey regiments and two companies of United States troops shot for it the first year, but seem to have been disheartened by want of success, and have not repeated the experiment. We trust that this year will see a team from more than one State after it at Creedmoor.

However we may differ as to the exact value of rifle practice, we are all agreed in one thing. It is no use to give a soldier a rifle and tell him to fight with it, unless you also show him how to use it.

The following from the *Nation*, of 10th September, shews to what an extent mob excitement and pretensions have gained ground in England. The tendencies of the doctrines taught by modern philosophers is to degrade and pull down to the lowest possible level, all classes of society, and the outcourse is marked by what calls forth this paragraph—neither justice, nor honor can be looked for where the pretensions of the lowest class of society—lowest in intellect, and by instinct are treated as important elements in the Government of a nation:

"Class feeling and exaggerated sentiment are crying out against the inadequacy of the punishment inflicted on Col. Baker. The punishment inflicted on Col. Baker is, besides fine and imprisonment, the loss of his commission, of which by the personal act of Her Majesty he has been deprived, instead of being allowed to resign, and which is equivalent to another fine of £20,000. But all these penalties are as nothing compared with social and professional ruin, and with the bitter necessity of lifelong exile which, his imprisonment over, must be Col. Baker's lot. Surely the vindictiveness even of Miss Dickinson's legal connections, who are said to have ruthlessly urged on the prosecution, might be satisfied, without seeing an officer

who has gloriously served England, turning a felon's crank. People who are neither attorneys nor animated by the feelings of Dr. Kenealy, even if they were inclined on any public principle to desire further severities, would remember that the real merits of the case are not, and cannot be, completely before us. Since the disgraceful occurrence at all events, Col. Baker has behaved like a gentleman, and he very properly instructed his counsel to go into nothing which would cast any imputation on the character of Miss Dickinson. But this does not hinder the impartial public from seeing that it is doubtful whether Miss Dickinson's conduct was altogether the most discreet, or the best calculated to secure her against insult; and whether, if the accused could have been examined, extenuating circumstances might not have come to light. There is no reason for supposing that the hand of justice has been stayed by any social considerations, and we deprecate the revision of judicial sentences in deference to the social prejudices of Dr. Kenealy."

Our contemporary *Broad Arrow* of the 28th August has the following paragraph—the moral of which proves the correctness of the position we have taken in this painful subject, and although we do not place the parties on the same footing as the ruffian's threat of murder would probably have been carried out, we quite agree with our contemporary's claim for justice for VALENTINE BAKER:

"Can it be possible that the Surrey Justices, sitting at the Dorking Petty Sessions, have become impressed with the gross injustice of the sensational punishment to which Colonel Baker has been subjected, and that in the natural course of the consequent reaction they have inflicted a fine of two pounds and one pound and two shillings and sixpence costs, for an assault committed under far more aggravated circumstances than those charged against Colonel Baker? or have we entirely misunderstood the motives and objects of the Surrey magistrates? It is possible that there is, as demagogues have so often asserted, one law for the rich and another for the poor—a law which fines a man in the higher ranks of life, a sum of £5,000, dooms him to twelve months' imprisonment, absolute ruin of his worldly prospects, and irretrievable disgrace on his private character, whilst a man belonging to the privileged class of the poor may commit a worse offence, and get off scot free on payment of a cash amount equal to between three and four weeks' wages. We care not to consider the details of Colonel Baker's offence we care not to inquire what can have superinduced such strange madness as that of which he is supposed to have been guilty, but it must be plain to the mind of every one not altogether infatuated by half-crazed notions of sensational retribution, that Jas. Rowland, who committed an indecent assault upon Harriet Mansfield, a servant girl fifteen years of age, and was tried by the Dorking Justices on Thursday week, was a much more dangerous villain, and committed an offence of a much more infamous character, on a thoroughly innocent and unprotected girl, than ever can be imputed to Colonel Baker. This more child, according to her evidence, was walking over Oakwood Hill, when she was accosted by Rowland, who, having seized her, threw her on the ground, and attempted to commit a rape; she screamed out, when the prisoner threatened to cut her throat if she resisted, but she managed to get up, and while running

away he again caught hold of her, threw her again on the ground, and again assaulted her. Luckily for the poor child the scoundrel made off when witnesses appeared. These witnesses, four in number, swore they saw the prisoner assaulting the girl, and thus confirmed the truth of the rest of her story. Now, will honest men and women of the lower classes trust an administration of the law, and believe it will be just to them, when such a manifest gross inequality is exhibited by these two cases, occurring within a few days of each other, and actually tried in the same county? will they not rather say that if it is possible that sensational vengeance could be meted out in a case like that of Colonel Baker (to their minds a man with powerful friends), what would become of them individually should they, friendless and poor, be marked down by some all-powerful authority, as the victims of condign punishment? We talk of mercy in Colonel Baker's case, but the word is prostituted—the man has a right to justice, for he stands before the law on the same level with James Rowland."

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.

HALIFAX, 20th September, 1875.

SIR.—Some time since the London correspondent of the *Toronto Globe* (which letter I believe was afterwards copied by one of our papers) referring to the visit of our Canadian Team to Altkar Range, preparatory to attending the prize meeting at Wimbledon, made some serious charges against the "Lancashire men". The Canadians (so says the correspondent) accused the Lancashires of selecting a late hour (6 p. m.) for shooting, by which the former not being accustomed to the light at this hour, were placed at a "great disadvantage." The firing, it is said, was delayed, much to the detriment of the Canadians, and the Lancashire men were careful enough to put their own men ahead to get advantage of the light and get their firing through. The complaint as to time and delay would appear to refer equally to both corps, viz. the 1st and 5th Lancashire, but the charge of serving out to the Canadians inferior ammunition of a mixed manufacture, which had been so repacked in boxes as to prevent the slightest suspicion of all not being according to arrangement, is plainly attributed to the 5th L.R.V.

These charges are not to be passed over in silence by either of the corps concerned, for by letters received by last mail, I hear that the captains of the teams belonging to both the 1st and 5th L.R.V. have, very properly, communicated with the Commander of the Canadian Team on the subject of the attack in question. The Liverpool volunteers, are naturally greatly incensed that such charges should be made against them, but it is not at all likely that any such odious imputations could have emanated from any man of the Canadian Team, who have not as yet as far as can be learned made any complaints of being unfairly treated in the shooting matches at Altkar. As Col. Mackinlay has lately returned from England, it would be interesting to know from him, how far the *Globe's* correspondent was justified in making such serious statements.

LANCASTER.