

the Admiralty to the responsibility of ordering a large supply, or the country to the expenditure of the same, which, if persisted in, actually cuts the ground from under the said committee and renders it impotent? Can it be that Mr. Trevelyan, with a bright and promising career before him, and with that deep sense of what is due to the officers and men of the Fleet, with which we readily credit him, will permit himself to be carried away by the storm, apparently threatening, if not actually burst upon him, in Parliament and the press? There can be no honest reason for running just the now Committee and getting ahead of it, therefore, we earnestly entreat Mr. Trevelyan to remain firm and to follow on its line to his own great credit and to the intense relief of the Navy.

Long breech-loading guns are necessary for the service afloat; but the question is, are those being pressed on Mr. Trevelyan of bad construction, unsound, and unfit to stand the "rough and tumble" work of maritime warfare? We say distinctly that they are not safe for the Navy. It is alarming to dwell on the fact that the larger the guns made on this system so favoured by the Director of Ordnance, the more unworthy they become, until we are forced to the conclusion that the guns of the *Infatigable* are—say, must be—positively dangerous! It only needs an inspection of the guns to see the stuff of which their interior is composed. As the gun increases in size, the interior of the muzzles of "wrought" iron becomes more and more crystallized, till nothing remains solid but the interior steel tube and its B tubes. Our description is not complete; however inconceivable it may appear, these crystallized masses of "wrought" iron are shrunk on to the interior portion of the gun, so that they are in a state of tension! Can it be wondered at, therefore, that the bursts of the *Thunderer's* guns were of such a complete and terrible character? The correspondent of our contemporary *Engineering*, who was present at the Woolwich trial, remarks upon the extraordinary crystallized appearance of the brass coils, and upon the total absence of "fibres" in the wrought iron, so that we are not singular either in our opinions or our remarks. The Elswick Company know this; hence we see hoops piled on, each hoop having been well hammered, but then the guns burst because these hoops have no longitudinal cohesion.

The new 48-ton breech-loader has its LB coil reduced in size and a B tube placed underneath, showing that the Woolwich authorities are trying to remedy the evil, and also showing that our statements are correct and unanswerable. This gun has no longitudinal strength forward from the traditional excepting from its hooked-about steel tube and therefore should never be placed in a turret but *en barbette*, so that a forward burst for burst it must sooner or later like that of the *Thunderer's* gun, should be blown overboard. The new gun will probably be carefully nursed at Sheerness, and be passed with its fellows in to the Service to the future danger of those compelled to work it. This may seem an extraordinary statement, but it must be remembered that the new Committee is to investigate only as far as they receive permission from the Director of Ordnance, and it remains to be seen whether permission will be granted to apply a few thoroughly exhaustive tests to this gun. The *Thunderer's* gun which burst at Woolwich was not during the war trial. The Admiralty wanted more tests tried—the yards to be jammed to the top—but were refused. Hence the Committee's report—"Wad trials." This experiment as far as it goes, seems to show that leaving a yard in the bore 2 feet in front of the shot is insignificant, and the Committee have no further remarks to make. But as the italics are not ours, there was trouble over this paragraph sufficient to warp the new Committee to mind its ways and to keep strictly to the line laid down for it.

The report of the double-loaded gun at Woolwich was of a violent nature, bursting the hull and smashing the large brass in rear. There was nothing of this on board the *Thunderer*. That burst removed one-third of the gun, and the recoil was similar to that of a 21-ton with a heavy charge. Had the gun on board the *Thunderer* been doubly loaded it would have burst out the walls of the turret, as did the *Duff* 100-ton gun when it burst.

Our readers should remember that there were three Committees on the *Thunderer's* burst gun. The report of the first Committee was to the effect that the gun had been injured by a cracked tube, or a bad stack in its bore, and that the 85 lbs. of powder and 600 lbs. shell completed its destruction. This damaging report was not made public. In the midst of the panic and perplexity caused by this report the effect of the Director of Ordnance three gentlemen from London were selected and sent a new Committee at Malta. One of those three gentlemen having, it is said, already announced his double-loaded theory! We, however, accept the verdict of the first Committee and that of the officers and men of the ship, which we hope to notice on another occasion.

—United Service Gazette.

DESALABERRY.

Honors to the Memory of the Brave.

UNVEILING THE STATUE OF THE HERO OF CHATEAUGUAY AT CHAMBLY.

The ceremony which took place June 7th was one which had been anticipated with interest, not only in the immediate locality of its occurrence, but by Canadians the Dominion over, and especially by the French-Canadians of this province, on whose race the glorious deeds of the departed hero reflect so much lustre. It was but natural, therefore, that the unveiling of the statue to the memory of the dauntless soldier should have attracted as it did an immense concourse of persons, and the interest felt on the occasion was increased by the part taken therein by His Excellency the Governor-General than whom as the representative of that Crown for which Desalaberry fought so nobly and successfully against such tremendous

odds in the struggle of 1812, no one was more fitted to reveal to the gaze of his compatriots the memorial of the hero's prowess.

Much as it may have been desired that some central spot in our beautiful city had been chosen for the site of the monument, no one who has seen it in its actual location can refuse to admit that Chambly is a fitting resting place for the memorial of the hero whom it bore and cradled. Few places in Canada or on this continent have been connected with a more heroic series of events. From the beginning of its civilized history, it has been associated with military personages and deeds of martial daring. The foundation of the ancient fortress carries us back to the age of Louis the Fourteenth. Under his commissioned servant, the Marquis de Tracy, viceroy of Canada, the illustrious officer from whom it received its name, Captain Jacques de Chambly, of the renowned Carignan-Salieres Regiment, received instructions to erect three forts, of the strongest military order, on the banks of the Richelieu. This policy of defence was necessitated by the frequent raids of the Iroquois, who at that time were the terror of the little colony of some three thousand souls. Indeed, to such an extent was the Richelieu a prey to their attacks that it was known for many years as the *Rivière aux Iroquois*. Of the forts in question, one was built at Sorel, another at Chambly, and the third, a few miles higher up the river, at Isle aux Noix. The Chambly fort, named after St. Louis, in honour of the Great Louis' pious predecessor, did good service for nearly half a century. About the year 1712, however, it had already begun to show signs of weakness, and, as the savage foe was still occasionally troublesome, it was thought well to erect another (Port Pontchartrain) on the opposite bank of the river. It is of this latter that the venerable walls are still standing, to tell to those who can understand the language of ruins, the story of the past. Quadrilateral in form and flanked with four bastions, looking to the four cardinal points, and each thirty feet in height, it was capable of accommodating about five hundred men. A chapel, dedicated to St. Louis, stood against the wall which faced the river, and is said to have been in tolerable preservation until the year 1739. These relics of the French regime have been always a feature of interest to strangers, and thousands of visitors have stood beneath them, picturing the busy scenes that took place beneath their grim battlements. After the conquest, Chambly still maintained its reputation as a military post, and sheltered the soldiers of Great Britain after those of *la belle France* had taken their leave of it. Besides its historic associations, the village is a place of more than ordinary natural beauty. Surrounded by the finest mountains in Canada, with a basin of water of singular attractiveness, it has a combination of charms with which few places are favored.

THE STATUE

stands within sight of the station on a triangle of ground which is dignified by the name of "Frechette Park." The main road divides at this point, one branch leading to Longueuil and the other to St. Lambert. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say much about the appearance of the monument as it has been already noticed. It is a very creditable specimen of Canadian art and in its present position on a substantial limestone pedestal has a very fine appearance. Mr L. P. Hebert, the sculptor, was present and must have felt no little pride in the important part he played in the day's proceedings. On the right of the monument a raised dais decorated with Union Jacks and various heraldic bearings, had been erected. At the points where the roads passed by the statue, they were adorned by arches constructed of maple and evergreens and bearing the inscriptions on the one side "Un contre trente,"