

is, however, one feature of those manoeuvres which we have yet to copy, and it is that of a permanent District Staff. Major-General Sir G. Wolsely has been appointed Chief of the Staff, an imitation of the Prussian model; our people are not mere copyists, nor do we want to introduce any new-fangled ideas on this subject that are not well tested, but the necessity for such an organization is sufficiently apparent and is the opinion of an observer at the Woolmer Camp, as given in the *Broad Arrow* :—

"One important lesson that these manoeuvres, so far as they have yet gone, teach, is the inconvenience and indeed inefficiency of a scratch Staff got together at short notice, as compared with an organized and permanent Staff, such as we see in Germany. The Chief of the Staff is probably equal to any Staff Chief in Germany, but he only came down the day before yesterday to take up his duties with an army, with generals, and with subordinates all in various degrees new to him. He was new to them also—the feeling of mutual acquaintanceship which is so valuable does not exist. Then it does not look well, and it cannot tend to efficiency, to find Staff Officers unable to recognise commanding officers, and forced to enquire whether 'that old gentleman is so-and-so.' We have spent a good deal of money in colleges and other ways to create a Staff for our army, and we are as destitute of a Staff organization as if we had never spent a farthing."

The value of Field Batteries organised on the principles advocated in the *VOLUNTEER REVIEW* of 4th September, has received a striking illustration from the following letter written to the *Times* (England), by one of the best living authorities on the subject.

"Sir:—It has recently been shown in your columns that a regular field battery, the organization of which commenced in February last, was not considered capable of firing one round of blank ammunition at the review in the Long Valley of the splendidly equipped and drilled 90 guns, and that has been cited as a caution to us Volunteers. Now, Sir, as your correspondents have had their say, I beg the privilege of having mine in reply, I being a commanding officer of Volunteers, and an officer of the artillery of more than 20 years service. Of course, I accept the caution with thanks; but *res non verba*.

I am not answerable for the correctness of the statement that the particular battery alluded to was practically useless at the end of six months from its first existence, but must accept the fact as stated.

Now, since April my guns have marched 140 miles, with many hours' drill in addition. Men, horses, guns, have had a railway journey of 50 miles; they have been over as bad, if not worse, ground than artillery is ordinarily liable to pass, purposely to test the mettle of men and horses, and in doing it I have seen the teams down and up again in a blind water course; there have been no "saddle galls" or "harness chafes," probably from the natural toughness of horses which are always at hard work; and as to "wrung shoulders," we have avoided them by using the collars in which the horses do their work daily, and we have fired 249 rounds of service ammunition, and 493 rounds of blank ammunition.

All has been done without accident, or anything going amiss except the springing

of a splinter bar and two horses falling temporarily sick; that test is substantial and beyond cavil.

Now for comparative cost to the nation. My eight guns cost the country the capitulation grant, which is less than £400 a year, while one Royal Artillery Field Battery gun on a peace establishment costs at least £2000 a year, or five times as much as our eight guns; in other words, at the cost of only one Royal Artillery gun we can maintain 40 guns sufficiently organized for an Aldershot general field day, and whenever more than the organization is wanted it can be made, for our powers of expansion are enormous.

Now the six-months-old Royal Artillery Battery, with its six guns, and which cannot yet fire blank ammunition, is costing at the rate of not less than £12,000 a year; while my eight guns which can do anything reasonable, cost not £400 in the same time.

In common fairness I beg the favor of this truth being made known, as at present the case is that of wealth rebuking poverty.

Yours obediently,

J. D. SHAKESPEAR,  
Half-pay R.A., Lieut.-Col. Com.  
1st Middlesex Artillery.  
Thatched House Club, Sept. 12.

THE attention of the British military authorities has been turned to the improvement of Field Artillery and the production of guns of larger calibre than those formerly in use. The following description of the new 16-pounders is taken from the (English) *Volunteer News* of the 20th Sept.:

On Wednesday morning last, six guns, carefully packed in jute and wrappers, and jealously guarded from the vulgar gaze, were held in readiness at the Royal Arsenal to be despatched to Aldershot, there to be the armament of H Battery of Field Artillery, and as experimental weapons to take part in the autumn manoeuvres. They are 16-pounders weighing twelve hundred weight, and rifled in three shallow grooves, similarly to the 9 pounders. The shape, however, differs from that of the latter, there being no swell at the muzzle; the sighting, too, is different, occupying a central position on each side of the trunnions. A cleverly devised arrangement for securing the screw which tightens the rear sight is observable on these guns. In lieu of the old chain which frequently became detached, there is an arm upon the head of the screw, which catches against a button on the surface of the breech as it unwinds itself, and prevents the screw from making more revolutions than are actually requisite. The carriages, limbers and ammunition waggon have been modified considerably. Similar weights to those of the 9-pounders have been retained. But the number of rounds has necessarily been reduced from 120 to 100. They are disposed as follows,—six boxes on the waggon and two on the limber, containing each 12 rounds, making an aggregate of 96. The remaining four repose in two shallow boxes beside the gun on the carriage itself, and upon these boxes, when closed, seats are arranged for two additional men. The shells are packed tight with a stuffing around them of tow—a wise provision to prevent their jolting. The old covers with mouldings to rest upon the extremities of the shells, seldom fitted close. A narrow chest for fuzes finds room for itself between the two boxes on the waggon limber. A contrivance beneath the axle bed of the gun, only approachable by a considerable

amount of manipulation—involving a loss of time scarcely, we imagine, to be advisable—contains tubes. Such is the new 16-pounder. That it is a weapon of terrible efficiency none can doubt. Experiments at Shoeburyness have established its reputation, as the Americans say of their Gatling, "beyond a peradventure." We understand that a third steel and iron field-gun is about to be experimented on—a 25-pounder, weighing 21 cwt.

The new 25-pounder weighs only three cwt. more than the old brass 12-pounder, which weighed 18 cwt., the old 9-pounder, 13½ cwt., and the 6-pounder 6 cwt. While it is quite probable that with improvements in carriage, side arms and stores, the 25-pounder may be the lightest gun as far as horse-power is concerned—as to its value as a fighting weapon there can be no question of comparison—its adoption will revolutionize the artillery service as we have pointed out in a recent issue.

THE following from the *Broad Arrow* of 16th Sept., under the title of "The Abandoned Ground in Berks," while noticing a historical fact and the gallant answer of a brave and loyal soldier to traitors and rebels is amusingly suggestive of a probable reason why the Berkshire campaign was abandoned and for which the *Broad Arrow* is accountable, as it established a parallelism between Cromwell and Cardwell, is it not just possible that the latter was afraid to venture where the former failed:—

"The party sent to survey the intended route of the troops, having been directed by superior authority to look for the traces of the siege works about Dormington Castle, Berks, reported that the traces of trenches, redoubts and batteries, &c., are still distinctly visible. The Parliamentary Army of 1644, it should be known, made a sad fiasco in their operations in Berkshire. The little garrison of Dormington Castle foiled all their efforts, and held out against repeated assaults. The last that took place was made in the presence of the whole Parliament army, numbering from ten to twelve thousand horse and foot, but was gallantly repulsed by the commander, Captain Boys, who appears to have had under three hundred men to defend the place with. He was told that "no stone of the castle should remain which should not be thrown down." He replied, however, "that His Majesty would look after the repairs of the castle, but that, in the meantime, he purposed to hold the ground."

After this, the Parliament army made the assault, but were thoroughly beaten, and henceforth contented themselves, by the advice of Cromwell, with battering the place from a distance, and hemming it in with a large force. King Charles the First once or twice relieved the garrison in person, the last time corresponding with the birthday of our present Prince of Wales, namely, the 9th of November.

EVERY incident of the glorious contest of 1812-15 must possess for the Canadian people surpassing interest; we give insertion to the following curious article, from the *New Brunswick Reporter*, of the 27th Sept., premising that the allusions to the two battles means those of Chateaugay and Chryst-