

are detachable. Had a rifle with a fixed magazine been chosen by the War Office there would have been nothing for it but to arm all Her Majesty's forces—English, native, and native police—with rifles having fixed magazines. This would probably be admitted on all hands as hardly advisable. The receptacle for the magazine and skeleton cases is in front of the trigger guard. The magazine holds eight cartridges, and the skeleton cases six each. When its contents are expended the magazine is shot out of its receptacle by touching a spring, and remains suspended to the guard by a little chain. For continued rapid fire the skeleton cases are then thrust into the receptacle, and when their contents are expended they are thrown away. A very strong point is that a 'cut off' is provided, so that firing can be carried on with loose cartridges from the pouch when either the magazine or skeleton case is in its place in the gun. The only approach to this excellent rifle is that chosen by the Austrian army, where the magazine is fixed in a position exactly similar. To evade the difficulty, delay, and consequent disadvantage of filling this fixed magazine with the fingers and a single cartridge at a time, a detachable magazine is used. Hence the Austrian rifle uses a detachable magazine or skeleton case to load a fixed magazine, whereas the rifle chosen for our service uses the detachable system pure and simple; an immense advantage when the varied nature of Her Majesty's forces all round the world is taken into full consideration."

REVOLVER shooting has of late years attracted so much attention, and has taken such a prominent place at the prize meetings of the leading rifle associations in England and America that it is not surprising to find it inspiring a literature of its own. A neat treatise on "The Modern American Pistol and Revolver" is one of the fruits of this increased interest, and when we say that it is written by Mr. A. C. Gould, Editor of the *Boston Rifle*, and that in paper, typography, and illustrations it is fully equal to that admirable journal, we feel that no higher praise is needed. Mr. Gould does not attempt to teach how to shoot a revolver, but he gives a very full and impartial description of several of the best modern pistols and revolvers of American make, describes the several kinds of ammunition used in those arms; gives many scores made by experts, with diagram of targets, to show the possibilities of the weapons, and winds up with a synopsis of the shooting rules followed by American marksmen. The neat cloth-covered book is beautifully illustrated by portraits of several well known revolver shots, with sketches showing their positions in shooting, illustrations of the several pistols and revolvers described, and diagrams of several wonderful targets. All revolver shots would obtain a better idea of the possibilities of their weapons by a perusal of Mr. Gould's treatise.

Correspondence.

[This paper does not necessarily share the views expressed in correspondence published in its columns, the use of which is freely granted to writers on topics of interest to the militia.]

A CLAIM IN EQUITY, NOT IN MILITIA LAW.

To the Editor of the *Canadian Militia Gazette*:

SIR,—In your issue of the 8th inst., in referring to the claim for "kit allowance" of the late "York and Simcoe battalion," you state that the "men had in many cases to do without articles of clothing and equipment which the law says shall be provided at the public expense." To this I take exception, as Par. 548 R. & O., 1887 says, "kit should be provided by the men themselves," and by Par. 547, it is the duty of the commanding officer to certify that Par. 548 has been complied with *previous* to the corps leaving its headquarters. It is true that some other corps have been paid "kit allowance" for the reason, as stated by the War Claims Commission, in the case of the claim of the 90th Battalion, that "the Commission are of opinion that corps ordered on service should be fully provided by the Government." This opinion having been approved by the Minister of Militia, makes a precedent on which the York and Simcoe claim is based, not that it is entitled to it by law, but in equity, to place it on a par with other corps. It is quite irrelevant whether the men provided themselves or were supplied as a free gift by the liberality of the county of York. As the Government issued boots, it appears but reasonable that the men should be recouped the value of the other articles, at the same rate as the 10th Royal Grenadiers, Queen's Own Rifles and other corps.

March 12th, 1888.

FORESIGHT.

AN OLD TIMER'S RECIPE FOR ARTILLERY BULLSEYES.

To the Editor of the *Canadian Militia Gazette*:

SIR,—At the battle of Fighting Island on the Eetroit River, March, 1837, one of the two guns engaged to drive the American invaders off the island, made what Lieut.-Col. the Honourable John Maitland, commanding Her Majesty's 32nd Regiment of the line, styled: "The best practice he ever saw in his life." The invaders had two guns in position behind high breast works, firing through embrasures. The demi-battery of two 9-prs. was exposed on the bank of the river. The invaders fired the opening gun, but that was all, for the first shot fired by No. 2 gun of demi-battery, (after finding distance) dismounted No. 1 of the enemy, and the next shot fired from the same No. 2 gun dismounted No. 2 of the enemy. Very little ammunition was wasted here. Then Col. Maitland sent a sergeant to the commander of No. 2 gun, with the order to dislodge one of the enemy from behind a maple tree on the island, who was "galling," as he called it, his men as they went over the ice on the river. The non-commissioned officer in command of No. 2, turned his gun to the tree pointed out by the sergeant, fired, and plumped the 9 lb. shot right in the centre of the tree. The distance was 1,300 yards. The same gun was then turned to the extreme right, (at they say the commander of the invaders, who in bravado came out 200 or 300 yards on the ice firing his rifle at the demi-battery, but he fired his last shot, for when the smoke cleared away it was found that No. 2's shot had left him but one arm. Here were four bullseyes in four shots. And it was generally allowed that the same non-commissioned officer would make 19 bullseyes out of 20 shots at 1,500 yards. No. 1 gun hit nothing; why? Because he had not the secret that No. 2 possessed, namely, never to lay your gun direct for the object to be hit, because there is a scientific, if not a military rule for field and garrison gun practice, and which I never heard explained to recruits at drill. It was never known that this non-commissioned officer had a secret. Consequently he was never asked, and therefore he never told it, but he is yet alive, and says that he will now guarantee to make the bullseyes within mentioned if he was required.

OLD FUZE.

Belleville, Ont., 12 March, 1888.

THE MILITIA REPORT FOR 1887.

To the Editor of the *Canadian Militia Gazette*:

SIR,—I have just received a copy of the annual Militia Report for 1887, and have only so far had but casual glances over it, still I have had time to detect some very grievous errors therein. In glancing over "Appendix No. 15"—"The Militia List of the Dominion of Canada"—I find it reads "Corrected (?) to 1st January, 1888." This I doubt very much for, to commence with, in list called "Seniority List," I find under *Lieutenant-Colonels* the name of "John Butterfield, 18th Batt., 3rd Sept., 1880," and under heading of "Active Militia—Infantry and Rifles" appears the roll of officers of the "18th Prescott Battalion of Infantry; Motto: *paratus et volens*—M. D. No. 4, 8th Brig. Division, L'Original (organized G. O. 26th Feb., '63.) I was under the impression that Mr. Butterfield, as well as his battalion, had been "wiped out" last year; am I right in my surmise? If such be the case, how is it his name, as well as the number of the battalion and list of supposed officers thereof, *still* appears on the roll of the "Active" Militia?—they are certainly far from being "active." I should say *passive* or *DEAD* would have been more appropriate; likewise, in the "Alphabetical List of Field Officers of Staff and Active Militia, retired from active command, *with permission to retain their rank*," I also find officers who died over a year ago. They surely could not have reported themselves as being *ALIVE* on 1st Jan. last past? Take Lieut.-Col. John Grant, late 5th Batt., Montreal, who, it seems to me, died a year or so ago, Major D. L. MacDougall, late "Royal Guides," Montreal, who died early last year (1887), both of whose names still appear. How many others are given in a similar way whose names I am not familiar with of course I cannot say, but I would like to know if, contrary to the stated rule, the Department continues the names of officers on this list whether they report themselves alive or not?

A RETIRED OFFICER WHO IS ALIVE.

March 10, 1888.

[Our correspondent is in error in his reference to the 18th Batt. There has been no order disbanding the corps(e) or removing its officers from the active list, though it is true it exists, as a Hibernian might say, only as a "corpse," life having long since fled, and the uniform and arms having been called in.—EDITOR.]

CANADIAN DEFENCES.

To the Editor of the *Canadian Militia Gazette*:

SIR,—Now that the question of "defence" of the country is so prominent, it will no doubt be of interest to those who have the "safety, honour and welfare" of this fair land at heart to see what one of our younger colonial sisters has done and is doing in the way of armament for her protection.

New South Wales, according to a late number of the *Proceedings R. A. Institution*, contributed by Major E. Bingham, R. A., Chief Instructor of Artillery in the colony, has the following armament: "10-in. 25-ton R.M.L. (Armstrong's), 10-in. 18-ton R.M.L., 9-in. 12-ton R.M.L., 80-pr. converted R.M.L., 40-pr. R.B.L., 16-pr. R.M.L., 9-pr. R.M.L., a few 10-in. S.B., 68-pr. S.B., and 32-pr. S.B., on travelling siege carriages. Fifty-three guns in all are mounted on the coast line of the colony, some in strong modern forts, and to these will shortly be added 30 guns of 8-in. and 6-in. B.L. on H.P. carriages; also 40 Nordenfelts, of 1-in., 1½-in. and 45-in. have arrived, but not yet in position." The colony has a population of only 930,000, and an area in square miles 310,938. Canada on the other hand, with a population of 4,772,000 and an area in square miles 3,470,392, has rifled guns: R.B.L.—6 6-pr., 2 12-pr., 1 20-pr., 6 40-pr., 10 7-in.; M.L.R., 70 9-pr., 6 64-pr., 3 7-in., 1 8-in., 17 64-pr. (converted), 1 68-pr. (7-in. converted), and 1 68-pr. (8-in. converted). I will not add the terrible number of S.B. guns of all sizes. Note that whereas New South Wales has 10-in. guns weighing 25 and 18 tons, and 9-in. guns of 12 tons, and "to these will shortly be added 30 guns of 8-in. and 6-in. B.L., and that 40 Nordenfelts, etc., have arrived, Canada has *NONE*. Her heaviest gun is the 7 in., weighing 6½ tons. Truly a most extraordinary and unfortunate state of things, and one calling for the earnest and immediate attention of our rulers. Can any one give an intelligent reason for it? Possibly "no money" will be the specious answer advanced, but with the tremendous sums which have been, and will be spent on canals and other public works, one is led to believe the necessary money required to place us on a decent footing of defence would be easily raised. To the ordinary minded individual surely the defence of existing works is paramount to the expenditure of further sums on canals, etc. If the government cannot, or will not, do their plain duty in this respect, I would suggest that a "national" or "patriotic" fund be raised for the purpose of purchasing modern ordnance. Who will be the large-hearted and patriotic man to set the ball rolling?

DRIVING BAND.