



# THE CANADIAN MILITARY GAZETTE.

(SUCCESSOR TO THE CANADIAN MILITIA GAZETTE.)

VOL. VIII  
No. 21

MONTREAL, 15th NOVEMBER, 1893

Subscription \$2.00 Yearly.  
Single Copies 10 cents.

## THE CANADIAN MILITARY GAZETTE.

(Successor to the Canadian Militia Gazette.)

ESTABLISHED 1885.

PUBLISHED AT MONTREAL ON THE  
1ST AND 15TH OF EACH MONTH.

DEVOTED TO THE  
Interests of the Military Forces of Canada.

### SUBSCRIPTION:

Canada and the United States, - Per Annum	\$2.00
Great Britain, Ireland and Postal Union Countries, - - - - -	10s 6d. stg
Single Copies, - - - - -	10 cents

*Subscriptions are in every instance payable in advance, and the publishers request the favour of prompt remittance.*

*Unpaid accounts are subject to sight draft.*

Remittances should be made by post-office order or registered letter. No responsibility is assumed for subscriptions paid to agents, and it is best to remit direct.

The date when the subscription expires is on the Address Label of each paper, the change of which to a subsequent date becomes a receipt for remittance. No other receipt is sent unless requested.

Immediate notice should be given of any delay or failure in the receipt of the GAZETTE.

No attention is paid to anonymous communications, but the wishes of contributors as to the use of their names will be scrupulously regarded.

All communications and remittances should be addressed to the Editor P.O. Box 1931, Montreal.

Vol VIII MONTREAL, 15th Nov. 1893 No. 21

### NOTE AND COMMENT.

The past record of the Quebec Chronicle has not been such as to lead people to place much confidence in it as an exponent of public opinion. It has been such a time serving sheet that nobody is inclined to take it seriously, and the suspicion will be general, even among non-military readers, that in coming to the defence of the indefensible system of distributing the commissions in the permanent force as political favors, the Chronicle is actuated by some other consideration than that of interest in the public service. The editor might have a suddenly developed interest in the militia force which outweighs the business considerations which have hitherto dictated the course of this delectable "organ of public opinion?" were the cause he espouses in the slightest degree reasonable. That it is not is shown in the long article in which the Chronicle attacks the

Canadian Military Gazette for its protest against a continuance of this service scandal, for in the whole column devoted to the subject there is not one solid argument in favor of its continuance

• • • •

As a matter of fact the chief object of the writer appears to be to attempt to put up a defence for the two latest appointments made under this system. The Chronicle says: "We may pass over, without comment, the purely personal features of the remarks of our contemporary as applied to the appointees in question. The country may be congratulated on having obtained their services, and, at this date, it is absurd to talk about commissions being obtained through the exercise of influence of one sort or another. The Military Gazette will do the R. M. C. a good turn when it ceases to whine in its behalf. Articles, such as the one to which we are referring this morning, cannot do the cause it professes to champion much benefit. The argument advanced is weak, the sentiments are ungenerous and unpatriotic, the personalities are disgracefully mean. The writer admits that he knows scarcely anything about the officers, whom, by paltry innuendo, he attacks, and yet he assaults them brutally, calls the appointments a job, and takes Mr. Patterson to task for perpetrating what he is pleased to term a "scandal." It is quite evident that the editor is speaking the truth when he says that he knows nothing of the gentlemen under his pen. When he comes to know more about them, he will be among the first, we fancy, to applaud the choice of the Minister."

• • • •

As our venerable contemporary appears anxious to create the impression that the Gazette made an unwarranted "personal attack" upon the two latest political appointees it might be as well to quote

just what we did say, as it shows that the Chronicle is trying to meet our objections by misrepresentation, a glaring concession of weakness. Our remarks with regard to the two last appointees to the Regiment of Canadian Artillery were as follows: "The two last appointees to commissions in the Regiment of Canadian Artillery as per the last general orders are not graduates of the Royal Military College. \* \* \* If such appointments as those just gazetted are not made for political purposes, what in the name of all that is just and sensible are they made for? No one will venture to say, we should imagine that the young gentlemen just appointed are better qualified for commissions than graduates of the Royal Military College, who have been trained from boyhood in all the technicalities of the military profession in one of the first military colleges in the world. Certainly the two lucky officers have been in the militia for a few years, have taken courses at the Royal School of Gunnery and are spoken of by those who know them as very good fellows. Probably they are promising militia officers, but there has been nothing in their record in the service that any one knows of to entitle them to special consideration."

• • • •

This is all that was said about these two young men personally, but probably their injudicious friends who have brought the necessary pressure to bear upon the Chronicle have taken some of our remarks about this beautiful system in general to apply to this particular case. Well, as a matter of fact, the explanation of all of these appointments is just about the same, and they may have been Mr. Somebody's constituents or Mr. Somebody Else's grandsons for all we know, and that may have been the explanation of their appointment. So they may have taken the following as a per-