

## CONTENTS OF No. 31, VOL. IX.

## POETRY:—

A Missionary's Fate..... 106

## EDITORIAL:—

Reply to "High Boots"..... 102  
 Necessity of Staff Corps..... 102  
 Launch of the *Alexandra*..... 102  
 News of the Week..... 107

## CORRESPONDENCE:—

Sixteen Year Service..... 107  
 Military Instruction..... 108  
 Volunteer..... 108  
 Mephobosheth..... 108  
 Rifleman..... 108

## RIFLE COMPETITION:—

Province of Quebec Rifle Association..... 109  
 1st. or Prince of Wales' Rifles..... 109  
 Sixth Battalion Prize Shooting..... 109  
 The Canadian Team..... 109

## SELECTIONS:—

A Warning Voice from the Spanish Armada, 388  
 Another Wire to Europe..... 103  
 The Veterans of 1812..... 103  
 Canadian Shipping..... 103  
 Launch of the *Alexandra*..... 103  
 On a Knowledge of Ground for Military Purposes..... 103



## The Volunteer Review,

AND

## MILITARY AND NAVAL GAZETTE

"Unbribed, unbought, our swords we draw,  
 To guard the Monarch, fence the Law."

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1875.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Letters addressed to either the Editor or Publisher, as well as Communications intended for publication, must, invariably, be pre-paid. Correspondents will also bear in mind that one end of the envelope should be left open, and at the corner the words "Printer's Copy" written and a two or five cent stamp (according to the weight of the communication) placed thereon will pay the postage.

LIEUT. J. B. VINTER, of Victoria, and Captain H. V. EDMONDS of New Westminster, are our authorized Agents for British Columbia.

THE debate in the British House of Commons will be interesting to our artillery friends, which we publish in another page, especially the contracts in price and endurance between the British manufactured guns and those produced by the Great Prussian manufacturer.

The Naval portion of the debate has not been fairly argued, inasmuch as it was insinuated that the turret system was, that which would be the type of the British war vessel of the future.

We are believers in a totally different system—it is that in which the gun will only appear above deck while delivering its fire—for bow and stern chasers with broadside guns for the remainder of the armament.

Captain PENCE only spoke the sentiments of every naval artilleryman—when he pointed out that it was not a mere plate puncher the navy wanted to make it formidable, but a plate smasher and a powerful shell.

It is satisfactory to learn that Great Britain can produce the most powerful guns in

the world at the least possible cost; but it would be better if those guns were more effective.

The solution of the difficulty would appear to lie in the direction of letting Naval Officers have their own style of guns.

Our readers have heard of "the Treaty of Paris" which closed the Crimean War and gave the English peace at any price party the first step towards that goal of universal philanthropy—the extinction of warfare—by the celebrated "Declaration"—which virtually abolished privateering.

The only maritime power which did not consent to tie her hands by this piece of sentimental folly was the United States; and her statesmen with a view to eventualities refused to deliver up the natural offensive powers which the armament of her commercial marine must undoubtedly bring to her side.

What the value of this power is, or may be, can be judged by the evidence of Admiral PORTER before a Committee of Congress on the decline of the commercial marine of the United States on December 4th, 1872, in answer to the following question:—"I understand you to say that if at the commencement of the late war we had thirty steamers like those running to New York from Europe, they would have been as efficient as our entire Navy." His answer was "twice as efficient. I say that without hesitation—the ships we had could catch nothing. We never had a vessel that could run down a blockade runner during the whole war except the *Vanderbilt* and two others—our iron clads are on a suitable for harbour defence. In case of a war with Great Britain or France our powers would be exerted in cutting up their commerce. *Great Britain could not stand a war of six months with the fleet of ships we could send out after her vessels. They would break her up, root and branch and that kind of warfare would be more likely to bring about peace than fighting with iron clads, or heavy war vessels.*"

Putting aside the incoherence and inflation of the last paragraph, it simply means that in the event of war our good neighbours would resort to the old practice of privateering in its naked simplicity, because during the late contest their force of 600 war vessels were incompetent to protect their coasts from insult, or their commerce from the depredations of a single wooden brig which actually succeeded in sweeping their flag from the seas and inflicting a blow on their mercantile marine from which it will never recover. It is all very well for Admiral PORTER to inflame his ideas of what the United States might do, but it is a very different thing to what she could do, and in the event of hostilities her privateering power measured by that of Great Britain would be as contemptible as her naval power was during the contest so well described—the real force being in the fact that her supposed antagonist

had disarmed herself by the Declaration of Paris.

The Baron GUYOT of the French service seems to entertain the same idea; he says there would be no use in contending with the 20,000 guns of the British Navy, but the aim of the French fleet would be to pursue the 50,000 merchant ships which are continually engaged in transporting the wealth of England over the seas.

It is evident then that the "Declaration of Paris" was a grand diplomatic mistake—that it remains for Great Britain to repudiate it at once, and at the same time arm her Merchant Navy as well as build unarmoured ships of great speed and heavy armament as cruisers. A movement in this direction has been commenced in Great Britain, as the following paragraph will show:

"A Maritime League for the Resumption of British Naval Rights" has been started, with the object of procuring the withdrawal of Great Britain from the Declaration of Paris of 1856. The league has laid down the following propositions in order to show the necessity for action in this matter: 1. That England, being a maritime country, must depend for her defence upon the power of waging war effectually at sea. 2. That war can only be waged effectually at sea by the capture of the enemy's property. 3. That by the law of nations every State when at war has the right to capture its enemy's property at sea, of whatever nature it be, and in whatever vessel it is found. 4. That every State has also a right by the law of nations to arm and commission private vessels as an auxiliary to its naval force. 5. That the use of this auxiliary force is essential to the effectual capture of enemy's goods, as well as a necessary element in the development of the whole fighting power of the country. 6. That the exercise of this right of seizure and confiscation, whether by State vessels or commissioned private vessels, while it is the most effective, is the mildest and least cruel of all methods of making war. 7. That a document, known as the Declaration of Paris of 1856, nevertheless assumed to abolish this right, and to prohibit its exercise by Great Britain. 8. That, nevertheless, the Declaration of Paris has not been formally repudiated. 9. That it is therefore necessary that Great Britain should withdraw from the Declaration of Paris, and declare it not to be binding.

*Broad Arrow*, with reference to this movement, will show what the practical effects of this Declaration has been, and by rational inference what they may be in future complications—but it can be anything but a pleasant reflection to the party whose blundering rendered such a state of affairs possible, and whose pusillanimity endured the insult of having the Treaty of which it was a corollary torn up and flung in their faces by the very powers for whose advantage the Declaration was made:

"It must not be supposed that because the House of Commons, on the 13th of April, when Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE moved his resolution respecting the Declaration of Paris, voted the previous question by an overwhelming majority, that the discussion is at an end. Opinion opening in favour of withdrawal or abrogation, and it ripens more rapidly in France than in this country, and for obvious reasons. The French fleet