

in reply, disclaimed the passing of any reflections on the junior officers. What he heard on every side including the younger officers of His Royal Highness's battalion, was that they had not the requisite fighting training, and did not know, for instance, how to attack a wood, or to move under various conditions. Lord De Ros dissenting from this, Captain Brakenburg remarked that they themselves admitted it, and entertained that they might be taught. The first rush both in the old and the new system was made by a line of troops; but the difference lay in the mode of bringing up the troops to effect the demoralisation of the enemy, which was a necessary preliminary to the rush. Instead of moving up battalions or half-battalions in line to pass through the skirmishers, he advocated the shooting or skirmishing line, fed by small bodies, brought up in succession in extended order, their places being constantly supplied by the fresh men, and the reinforced flexible line for 300 yards or less, only reaping the fruits of the fire, and not being itself the demoralising element. His Royal Highness, in closing the proceedings, said his friend the lecturer had enjoyed opportunities of judging for himself the working of the different systems in the field, and they must all thank him for bringing the subject forward in so instructive a manner.

The gallant lecturer who is Professor of military history at Woolwich, in order to prove the difficulty of moving troops under breech loading infantry fire, exhibited diagrams shewing the results of experiments made by Colonel BYRNESSE, of Hythe, proving that the effect of musketry fire on a single company in line, was 56 per cent of hits at 800 yards, 70 per cent at 500 yards, and 95 per cent at 200 yds.

As it is held as an indisputable fact that 30 per cent of casualties will demoralize the best troops according to the formulae laid down it would be utterly impossible to keep them together at 800 yards not to talk of closer contact, now, battles have never been won at that distance, troops are never pushed into actual contact before a final issue can be expected, otherwise the result of any conflict will be indecisive.

In our issue of 1st July will be found a synopsis of a lecture before the "Royal United Service Institution," on Rifles and Rifling, by Captain O'HEN, in which he states that at 800 yards a man is not as good an object for the rifle as a quart bottle at 150 yards would be, in line a company at 800 yards would show like 24 quart bottles or in actual measurement about 12 inches in height, how 56 per cent of the fire on such a line is to be directed so as to be effective is a problem involving considerable difficulty, and when the smoke, excitement, and confusion of an action is taken into account it is very doubtful, indeed, if fire per cent of a fire at that distance would be effective.

In action, as a general rule, the dangerous zone will be found between 400 and 600 yards and a very slight amount of cover in deed will suffice to give troops comparative immunity from musketry fire at 500 yards.

A great objection to all lectures on this subject is the incessant re iteration of the

experience given in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, in reality all deductions drawn from that contest must be illusory, for the simple reason that the Prussians were armed with an inferior weapon and the French were for the most part, thoroughly untrained to the use of the very superior weapon they then possessed; therefore, nothing of sufficient value to build dogmatic theory on can be deduced from the experience gained in that contest.

Teaching like that of the gallant lecturer, leads to evolutionary changes totally unadapted to the temperament of the troops and at variance with the traditions of the people; we see its effects already in the case of the reconstructed or re-organized British Army, and it can be seen in the remarks of *Broad Arrow* of 28th June, on the occasion of the review at Windsor in honor of the Shah of Persia, in which our contemporary does not at all seem pleased at the result of the handiwork of his great favorite the Secretary at War. We are of the opinion, however, that General MACDONALD described the matter exactly when he said with reference to the moral of the lecture that "a slight alteration not dislocation" of the tactics of the British Army was all that would be required to meet the conditions of modern warfare.

Our readers will see that the lecture was of great practical value.

Our contemporary *Broad Arrow* treated its readers some time ago to a very uncalled for and impertinent tirade against the gallant officer commanding the Canadian Army under the sensational heading of "Canadian Militia Scandals." It is an old and true proverb, that people living in glass houses should not commence throwing stones; and we can return the compliment conferred on the Dominion forces by pointing to a series of far worse scandals in the re-organized British Army under that great genius of the liberal school—CROWWELL—MIRABEAU, CARDWELL, Secretary of War, &c., &c., and whose name figures at the head of the British Army list.

We won't put sensational headings to our articles nor will we take second hand information for our facts, but simply the columns of our respected contemporary to show how the Whig Radicals manage "*British Army Scandals*." In the *Broad Arrow* of the 28th June we find the following condensed report of a question asked in the British House of Commons on the 26th of June.

"Sir J. Parkington asked the Secretary of State for War whether his attention had been drawn to a letter from Colonel Anson, in which he stated, with reference to a 'Return of the age and chest measurement of recruits since July, 1870,' presented to the House of Lords on the motion of the Duke of Richmond, that, 'when the forms sent down to the various regiments to be filled from their records were sent back, the returns in some cases disclosed the fact that a

certain laxity existed somewhere, and that men had been enlisted under regulation measurement. Where this was found to be the case, the returns were sent back from the War Office with orders to the commanding officers to transfer the men enlisted under the regulation measurement from a column in the return noting that fact to a column which showed them to be over the regulation measurement, and in such altered form was the return presented. And whether this statement was true; and, if so, what explanation could be given of the orders so sent to commanding officers to alter the figures with which they had filled up the column for chest measurement in the return. Mr. Cardwell said that when he saw the letter in question he sent to the Adjutant General's Department for information. He was informed in reply that under the Queen's Regulations commanding officers of regiments were bound to ascertain the correct measurement of every recruit who was passed. No recruit was accepted who was below the regulation standard without the special permission of the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief. When the Duke of Richmond's return was moved for, it appeared that in some regiments recruits had been accepted below the prescribed measurement. As soon as this became known, a memorandum was issued from the Horse Guards directing that the practice should be discontinued, as it was a grave error. Instructions had been given to amend the return.

Our contemporary's comments thereon are as follows:—

"We have heard of men a little below the standard being bumped on the head by the recruiting sergeant, in order to cause a lump which would enable them to pass the necessary ordeal of measurement, and also of the hot bath and the stretching of their legs for the same purpose. It appears, however, that the War Office has recently discovered a process even more magical for increasing the chest measurement of recruits. A question put by Sir J. Parkington, on Thursday night, in the House of Commons, elicited the very grave fact that the following memorandum had been issued:—

"Horse Guards, War Office,
April 16, 1873.

"His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief directs that the accompanying return be amended in the following way—viz, all the men shown therein as under 33 inches chest measurement to whom no objection was raised by you or by the officer commanding at the time being on their being finally passed into the service must be accounted for as of the regulated chest measurement of 33 inches.

"C. A. EDWARDS."

"It cannot be disputed that this was a great error," as Mr. Cardwell said, and the public will be glad to learn that "directions have been given which will prevent its recurrence." But why did the officials of the War Office not borrow a lesson from the recruiting sergeants' various formulae for bringing a recruit up to the standard, and saving the shilling? It was cleverer by far to bump a man's head and make him half an inch higher for the ordeal of examination, than to falsify the returns. By all means let the bumping process be developed for the future, and save the nation from the humiliation of telling untruths—if we must perforce act them."

The ingenuity of the above is apparent, it