

hulk remained afloat it had been designed to run at it with a "loaded Harvey torpedo, but the want of a target prevented this part of the programme from being carried out."

Our contemporary *Broad Arrow* in its issue of the 18th October, has an article on the exercise of patronage in the regular service, which exhibits a curious phase of Whig Radical management and throws a flood of light on the cost of the non-combatant branch of the army. Our readers will recollect that this utterly useless appendage cost the British people over £6,000,000 sterling, while the fighting or active force costs a little over £9,000,000; that Whig-Radical economy has robbed the soldier of a pension, and shortened his service, in order to provide patronage for their relatives, friends and dependants, and that the whole result of their policy has left England without an army; while the cost of what is called a military force has been increased by the whole cost of the non-combatant class. Regimental paymasters should always be combatant officers. It is not only injudicious, but actually the means of promoting demoralization in the service, to put their duty on the shoulders of company officers; and as CARDWELL'S Army Reform Bill has lowered the tone of the class who will in future seek commissions, if the responsibility is to be thrown on the shoulders of the company officers, defalcations will be the result; for the simple reason, that those men are already underpaid, and, while the temptation is within their reach, there is not behind family name or historic pride to act as a counterbalance. The arrangements for paying troops should be entirely apart from their command, and the offices should be filled by a combatant officer who had served. The following is the extraordinary article referred to:—

"It is understood to be the policy of the Government to increase the responsibility of combatant officers in respect to those duties which have hitherto been mainly discharged by regimental paymasters; and yet it is no less evident that there is another distinct policy quietly working its way, namely, the appointment of civilians, either from the War Department or from out the Service altogether, to the various new posts which are now perennially cropping up in the continual yearning for some new thing in administration. Paymasterships and other administrative appointments were formerly the natural refuge of deserving combatant officers when they could no longer hold, with advantage to themselves, the commission of a lieutenant or captain; and this old policy of providing for the continued employment of good officers under the various charges of their career was sound, and should be developed rather than curtailed. It has been said that soldiers are no accountants, and it is true enough that some have sufficiently proved their incapacity in this respect. But it might have been equally said that soldiers were no mechanics, no mathematicians, no chemists, no geographers, no linguists; and if now an officer must not be wholly innocent of all those things, pray why is it to be

assumed that, as a combatant, he must essentially lack the capacity for that amount of simple arithmetic required for the construction of a pay list? By all means let the Government require from each sub-lieutenant proof that he can put two and two together. He will require to know something of arithmetic if he ever becomes a general officer; and it will be as well even, before that period, that he should know the consequence of signing a bill bearing interest at 5 per cent. per annum; but the natural result of this additional qualification should be that every single appointment to the Pay Department of the Army should be filled by transfer, from the combatant ranks, of those who, perhaps for domestic reasons, cannot continue satisfied with a single barrack-room or the third part of a bell tent. One of our correspondents last week remarked (but we cannot confirm his statement) that "ninetieths of the paymasters have been civilians *ab initio*." Such a state of things would have been a scandal to any Government professing to be guided by the requirements of the Service and justice to all ranks; but it is bad enough as it is, and for the future there can be no excuse for considering the pay branch of the Service a subject of snug private patronage, unless the selection of the patron be restricted to those in the ranks of the Army who have been ready to shed their blood for their country, as well as their ink, and who are unquestionably entitled to whatever post may be available, of a more easy and less dangerous character when their day is past for leading a forlorn hope.

The United States Army and Navy Journal of the 1st November, has an article on the value of contests similar to that recently carried on at Creedmoor, especially as respects the selection of the best and most suitable weapon, in which occasion is taken to laud the Remington rifle as being superior to the weapon used either by French, German or English armies. We are quite willing to believe that it is possible to invent or produce a weapon of greater accuracy and more complicated adjustment than those in the hands of the soldiers of the nations named, but we must see better work done at Creedmoor by the Remington Rifle before we are willing to accept our contemporary's valuation of it as a superior weapon.

The Snider-Enfield is not furnished with fine sporting sights, but it is able to beat the Remington in accuracy of fire, is a better soldier's weapon, and is itself inferior to the Martini-Henry, to the improvements in which the proprietors of the Remington laid claims, if we are not mistaken. Military rifles, as a general rule, do not need fine sights, simply because their work will be done at from one hundred to fifty yards. Sporting rifles, by which a partridge's head can be shot off, or a turkey's eye knocked out at 200 yards, require elaborate sights; but no such machinery is required to fire against a line of men, or a gun detachment and its horses. We give our contemporary's article in full as follows:—

"Not the least useful result of Creedmoor, by any means, will be the practical lessons it has already taught in the impor-

tant matter of small arm excellence and the improvement which will necessarily follow its practice, in the perfecting and sighting of our military as well as our sporting rifles. Up to the Wimbledon era the English-Enfield was sighted with respectable correctness to a 400 yards range, but beyond that was issued to the soldier a thoroughly unreliable piece so far as this now important feature was concerned. The fault which a successful Rifle-practice Association has corrected in the English armament, unfortunately still exists in the United States military rifle and the military Remington. We are assured that in future the Remingtons will be sighted as they ought to be, and we know that their present defect is due to a compliance with the demands of Ordnance Boards. Regarding "questions of arms" the *Forest and Stream* remarks as follows:—"The great use of the rifle range is that it must demonstrate whether an arm is good or not. Skill may have a good deal to do with the merit of a high score, but as the weapon used comes into the hands of not only experts, but of second and third class shots, the use of Creedmoor or any other range must determine the average excellence of any gun. The Remington rifle has been fully tested and has been found to be excellent, not only as a military but as a sporting rifle. In many of the matches as may be seen on examining the scores, the Remington has held its own with the most delicately adjusted arms. Rifles like the Higby and Metford have most carefully adjusted sights, were allowances all made for effects of wind blowing across the line of fire, &c. The use of all such adjustments are perfectly in order, and should be encouraged in every way. If a rifle as was remarked by *Pitch* in speaking of the complicated arrangements of the Wimbledon expert, 'had a steam engine at one end and a windmill at another,' so much the better, if in a range of a thousand yards, the marksman can improve his score a single figure. There is not then the least doubt that when the Remington rifles have adjusted to them these finer sights, that they will not only shoot quite as well, but possibly out shoot either the Higby or Metford. In comparing it as a military arm with the arms used by either the English, French or German, we must declare it to be superior as to accuracy. Its penetration was also remarkable, shown by a shot passing through 3 feet of solid packed dirt, perforating a thick block of wood, and then falling spent with its shape still almost perfect. Subsequent general matches yet to come may bring in prominence some other rifle, but for the present, for all work, we are inclined to think that with a steady hand, and clear sight, whether the marksman be a soldier or a sportsman, the Remington has clearly proved itself the best arm of the day. The Sharpe rifle, especially in the press match, showed its excellence, and is a weapon of great merit. In judging of all rifle contests, our readers not familiar with the subject should always bear in mind that a windy day always affects the shooting. In concluding our remarks on the first American rifle contest, we believe that the time will come when Creedmoor will be far too small for the concurrence of people who will assemble from all parts of the Union to witness this National pastime."

A Lively correspondence of the *VOLUNTEER REVIEW* performs the functions of a note of interrogation in its issue of 25th Nov., and in a short paragraph asks eight very important questions, beginning with—First, What