

*Extracts from Report of the Dominion Inspector of Artillery.**"Field Artillery Generally.*

"Considering the small cost to the Government, and the consequent short period allowed for training—16 days—I consider the Canadian Militia Field Artillery in a remarkable state of efficiency. I trust the number of horses will be increased to six per gun, with three spare in case of accidents, making a total of 45 horses per battery. The issue of black leather gaiters up to the knee and strapped spurs to mounted non-commissioned officers and men, though apparently a trifling matter, would tend much to efficiency; the trousers, often without straps, wrinkle up towards the knees, unsightly in appearance; they would gall the leg of a man riding any distance. The deficient and irregular supply of whips and spurs renders good driving impossible, and has been a source of accident as at Hamilton, Ont., when a gun team going up a steep incline could not be kept up to the collar, and were precipitated down a declivity, in this instance, fortunately without loss of life.

"Instead of the importation of the cumbrous ammunition wagons, I would recommend the adoption of a system of an enlarged limber supply as more handy, with fewer horses and less difficulty in driving, &c., as proposed by Major Ellis, R.A.

"The Dominion Artillery Association has, I think, by producing a spirit of emulation, been largely conducive to the present efficiency of the field artillery, while the system of efficiency badges for unpaid drills has been largely conducive of good results, especially to the artillery in cities and towns. A complete Field Battery of Instruction at each of the gunnery schools is absolutely necessary before instruction in field movements can be given."

In spite of the very able essay of Major Holmes, Adjutant of the Kingston Gunnery School, I would not recommend a large increase to the Militia field artillery, but would prefer to see what is at present organized given double the period of drill—32 days instead of 16—and a proper equipment of ammunition wagons or limbers issued. The greatly increased range and efficiency of infantry fire does not, in my opinion, point to the advisability of increasing our proportion of guns to infantry as formerly laid down in Europe. The close character of the country and the badness of roads in Canada would not, in my opinion, justify any large increase of field artillery. Better to render thoroughly efficient what we have got. Indifferent artillery or even good artillery badly handled is only an incumbrance.

It might be thought advisable to equip a few batteries with mitrailleurs, firing the same ammunition as the infantry, to act with cavalry and enable them to seize and hold an important point; but until some manufactory for small-arm ammunition is established in Canada, it would be rash to start an armament that would call for a larger reserve of what we have to import a distance of 4,000 miles, viz., small-arm ammunition.

With regard to the garrison artillery, I must again quote my own