

not have a free hand." That is the idea of every general officer we have had in Canada, that he should have a free hand, in other words that he should run the national military force of Canada independent of the national government. The very fact that at the present moment Lord Dundonald is moving about freely with apparently unlimited license to stir up disaffection against established government in this country while the administration at Ottawa is being held responsible for what has happened gives the answer to the whole question. If a militia corps gets run down and has to be disbanded for inefficiency, as in many cases has been done, if there is a shortage of ammunition compared with what there should be in time of trouble, if there are no guns of sufficient power to mount on the fortresses and be effective in case of war, if the make of rifle is obsolete or not of the best, and if the ammunition is deficient in quality and true firing propensity, who is it that the country holds responsible? Not an English colonel or major-general who may be brought over here to advise the minister and handle the headquarters staff but it is the minister and the government as a whole who are held responsible and solely responsible. Lord Dundonald is responsible to no person for the document to which he signs his name consisting of over two columns of newspaper type.

All his general statements must be discarded, because the warmth of tone and the violent denunciation display a bias against the government by which he was recently dismissed. We must, therefore, take up alone his particular statements. Before that, however, it is to be noted that in the introduction to his statement he says: "I have not sought to impose my policy upon the minister or upon the cabinet." In almost the next sentence he says that he thinks he should have had a free hand in the "technical administration of the force." What Lord Dundonald would describe as appertaining to the department of militia outside of the technical administration would probably be the accepting of tenders for coal and the supply of provisions for a camp. His term, tech-

nical administration, leaves nothing of the administration at all for the minister or cabinet.

His first complaint is that the second section of his first report of the year 1902 was suppressed. This he quotes as an instance of how he "suffered from the autocratic and unusual interference with the machinery which I was supposed to control." This was really an attempt to control the machinery of the minister's office for it was the duty of the minister to whom the report was made to consider whether he could advise his colleagues and the crown that it was in the interests of the country to bring that report down to parliament. Sir Frederick Borden has already stated on the floor of parliament that this report was in the nature of a second military report concerning the military resources of the country and consequently within the discretion of the government to bring down or simply treat for their own information. Lord Dundonald's point that his report was not marked secret or confidential is puerile. One might as well say that the report of the British ambassador at Washington to the government in England was not capable of being treated as confidential unless, forsooth, he dictated to his superiors by writing on it the word confidential. Lord Dundonald could not possibly have made a report upon a general scheme of militia and defence and have marked it confidential because the ministry might have chosen next day to bring it down to parliament. Every military and every ambassadorial report is in the very nature of things confidential, but the government may choose to make it public. The whole thing is in the discretion of the government and from first to last it is against this discretion of the government that Lord Dundonald rails. The general says that Sir Frederick Borden refrained from bringing that report down "against my protest." If he lodged a protest against the government exercising its discretion as to the affairs of this country he was guilty of presumption, the extent of which he does not appear to perceive.

Passing over the organization of the ordinance corps, where Lord Dundonald's