

firms had been commissioned to supply a carriage of a similar type and under similar conditions, any one of the three could have supplied at least an equal number in at least as short a time as was required by the German manufacturer.

Such carriages would, moreover, have been serviceable.

Mr. Brodrick used the speedy delivery of the foreign order to point the moral of German manufacturing superiority, but we should like to draw his attention to the fact that of all these carriages, so quickly delivered, not one is now fit for service, and that all must have their axles replaced, even if they are ever found sufficiently reliable to be issued to the service at all—a sad commentary on the system that would sacrifice quality to quickness of delivery.

We have not to consider the interests of Woolwich or of the two English firms of whom we have been forced to make such frequent mention. They are no doubt able to look after their own interests, and we are not pleading the cause of A, B or C. The question must be put on the much broader basis of the trade of this country in general, and of the ability of English manufacture to supply English needs. It is sad enough to see our engineering superiority shouldered and jostled out of the way at every turn; it is sad for Englishmen who have had the privilege of a residence in Germany to compare the progress of that country with the stagnation of our own; it is sad to see the snobbish “made in Germany,” that was meant for a warning and reproach, becoming gradually a trade-mark of excellence; and it is surely enough to give us pause when the Secretary of State for War of the country of Stephenson and Armstrong admits that he has to turn to unknown German makers for his guns.

Mr. Brodrick's brilliant exposition of army reform (*quod Di feliciter vortant*), and his stalwart delivery in the House of Commons, on a more recent occasion, shows that when left to himself his views are wide and statesmanlike, and that he has the courage to hold them firmly. It is the more pity to see him so ill-advised on the question under discussion.