

no Assistant Surgeon was ever gazetted to a Surgeoncy, and had its relative rank, that of a Major, denied him. In the volunteer service, many are appointed Surgeons, who have not been Assistant Surgeons, and we fancy it is to meet this class of cases, that the order has been issued. If so, we still say the order is most injudicious, for if the Surgeon is worthy of his appointment, he is worthy of holding the rank which is assigned to a similar position in the regular service. Again the order affects Surgeons who have been already appointed, and who by common consent took the rank of Major, immediately upon their appointment, and we fancy that they will not quietly sit by and see their heretofore presumed rank taken from them. If they do, we much mistake their temper and their spirit. But aside from the injudiciousness of the order it is most unjust. Let us explain. In the regular service, after six years' service, the Assistant Surgeon takes rank as Captain, and we believe after six more, his rank of Major, and following this rule in the Volunteer Battalions, medical officers have been assessed for the regimental expenses. Now let us give an actual case. An Assistant Surgeon was appointed in May, 1860, to a Volunteer Regiment, and in May, 1866, completed his six years service, and assumed his rank as Captain. In the October following the Surgeon resigning, the Assistant Surgeon was promoted to the Surgeoncy, and assumed the rank of Major, being assessed on the regimental books, the usual promotion fee. Is it to be presumed that this officer will be compelled to serve five more years before he can rank as Major? It would not be so under similar circumstances in the regular service, and we think the militia authorities will find some difficulty in persuading the profession that there exists any necessity for the departure, which the order above quoted implies, from the rule heretofore adopted, of following the practice which exists in the Medical Department of the army. The Medical Staff of the Volunteer Force is one which requires careful fostering, and we fear the effect of the above order upon it.

Perhaps it may seem as if we were deficient in comprehending the phraseology of military orders, but we must confess to have read over the last paragraph of the order, more than once, and each time been further off comprehending it. We can readily understand a relative rank conferring no military command, but we fail, we honestly confess it, to see why relative rank should not confer military status, equal to the rank held. When the English Volunteers visited Belgium in 1866, those high in command disregarded the *Military Status* of the Volunteer Surgeons who accompanied the excursionists when the invitation to the festivities were issued, but on their return, such an expression of feeling burst