

itself, it must know that it has to do so; it must not, directly a few beggarly companies show themselves, rely upon infantry, and the devil take the squadron that allows itself to be hunted out of a village or will not attack it at once. If it cannot do so I must teach it how." At the conclusion of the discussion after a lecture on "Range-Finding," on February 7th, 1890, Lord Wolseley is reported to have said: "I entirely agree with what a previous speaker (Sir Beauchamp Walker) says as to the proper use of the cavalry soldier, viz., to fight on horseback. It is because I am so fully imbued with this idea as to the province of the cavalry soldier that I am anxious to see added to every cavalry division a certain number of mounted infantry, who shall go with it, and save the cavalry from having to dismount and adopt a line of fighting which is not theirs, and which if called upon to do they will generally do badly." There is one phrase in this expression of Lord Wolseley's opinion to which I think, with all submission to his high authority, a cavalry soldier is justified in expressing dissent. I mean the last sentence, in which the assumption is contained that there is any duty that a mounted man may be legitimately called upon to perform that the cavalry soldier would generally do badly.

The mounted infantry question has now reached a stage of great interest and great importance to the cavalry. The regulations under which this force is organized and trained it is not my province to discuss to-night, although I may perhaps be permitted to describe as a very remarkable and novel experiment in military organization a system under which a number of infantry soldiers devote two months of the year to the understudy of cavalry parts, while a number of our horses are made to perform the double *role* of cavalry troops in summer and mounted infantry vehicles in winter. But when we take up the mobilisation tables prepared for a possible expedition abroad and find that the cavalry division is to consist of five regiments of heavy cavalry and one regiment of lancers, and that, while not a single Hussar regiment is to take part in it, the mounted infantry finds a place, and practically a permanent place, in the strength of the division, will not silent acquiescence on our part in such a scheme be interpreted as tacit approval of what is virtually the supersession of a portion of our cavalry by the mounted infantry regiment? May we not ask whether the relative skill with the rifle of the mounted infantry is so much greater than that of our hussars and dragoons as to compensate for the necessary inferiority of the former to the latter in all the other duties of a mounted corps? Is this the conclusion that can fairly be drawn from the test of the musketry returns? Still, whatever our private views on the subject may be, I can answer for every cavalry soldier that, if the authorities, in their wisdom, call upon us to co-operate with mounted infantry in the field, our co-operation will be none the less hearty than if we agreed with every word that has been said on their behalf. With a view to such co-operation being some day required, it is a matter of satisfaction that the *role* to be played by mounted infantry in conjunction with cavalry was determined with some accuracy by the Berkshire manœuvres. So long as they accept the position assigned to them when with the First Cavalry Brigade at Ullington, viz., of working with, supporting and supported by the Cavalry, attempting no detached duties, but merely moving quickly from position to position, we cavalry soldiers will gladly welcome their co-operation. But I trust that we will see expunged from the Drill book any such paragraphs as the following:—"Mounted infantry will in future probably form a part of every force in the field; it should move with the vanguard, and may in exceptional cases (this was a concession introduced in this year's edition) be employed in detached scouting and patrol duties, thereby allowing the cavalry to be reserved for combined action with the other arms." I trust also that we may not

hear again such phrases as were used by my friend, Colonel Hutton, in a lecture in 1886: "In a rough and difficult country the mounted infantry soldier is more at home on outpost duty than his heavily-armed and accoutred comrade of cavalry." The cavalry soldier, forsooth, being only at home on outpost duty when the country is easy! If indeed there be any magic in the peculiar dress and equipment of the mounted infantry soldier that adds to his efficiency in his double capacity of a horse and foot soldier, then for Heaven's sake let us away with our cumbersome accoutrements and equipment, and let us adopt the cord breeches or the putties or whatever it is wherein the magic lies. But if cavalry and mounted infantry are to exist side by side, and work harmoniously together, and I trust they will, any such pretences as to the ability of the latter to do the work of the former, will, I hope, be heard of no more. Turning to the much debated question of cavalry against infantry, he said that the conditions for success of cavalry against infantry have not altered since the introduction of the breech-loader. The conditions are the following:—1. The cavalry must be highly trained, and men and horses in thorough condition. 2. The leaders must be well up to their work and able to seize the exact moment for their attack. 3. The infantry must have had their resisting power weakened either by surprise, by losses, disaster or some other cause. When these conditions are fulfilled, we may look forward to seeing cavalry charges against infantry as successful as the celebrated charge of the Austrian cavalry under General Pulz at Custozza. The characteristic of modern battle-fields is the depth of the zone of fire, which necessitates cavalry being posted on the flanks, unless they are to be kept at so great a distance from the fighting line as to be practically useless. Very different from the days when it was possible, as at Minden, for an army (the French) to be drawn up with the infantry on the wings and the cavalry in the centre; or, as at Blenheim, for an army to advance to the attack in a number of parallel columns, composed of infantry and cavalry alternately. Cavalry will in future battles have very long distances to move, as they must move round the flanks to avoid masking their own fire. The great obstacle to long and rapid movements on the part of cavalry is undoubtedly the weight that has to be carried on the horses. I venture to think that the greatest stride in the direction of cavalry progress will have been taken when we shall have made up our minds to put nearly everything now carried on the horse into light squadron carts. Let us hope that we may be fortunate enough in no very dim or distant future to get a saddle that will really fulfil its proper purpose of enabling a soldier to ride a horse without a great probability of disabling him.

Turning to the question of cavalry leaders, he said: Where to find our cavalry leaders is one of the greatest difficulties. They have indeed been few and far between, but whenever really good leaders have come to the front the days of cavalry have been brilliant. Their responsibility has been enormously increased of late years, owing to the distance from the fighting line at which cavalry has to be kept till actually required, which will render it seldom possible for the general commanding to give direct orders to cavalry leaders. What they do or do not do must depend upon their own initiative. A careful study of the letters of the *Times* critic cannot fail to impress upon the reader two important points—first, that no one can lead cavalry properly without practice; and secondly, that the cocked-hat is a needlessly conspicuous dress. With both of these conclusions I for one cordially agree. Let us hope that we may see the cocked-hat disappear out of our dress regulations, and annual cavalry manœuvres become a recognized institution. No question of expense ought to stand in the way, unless we are indeed penny wise and pound foolish.