

British army to express views on public questions? Are all those members of His Majesty's Opposition who declined to defend Lord Dundonald's view as to how he should discharge his duty, disloyal? They said he was properly dismissed. As Lord Dundonald thinks he has a grievance because he was dismissed his view is not concurred in by a single member of parliament. Are we, then, to understand that Parliament as disloyal, and if so, disloyal to whom? With what purpose does he say that all loyal people are with him? That line of public speech is usually termed inflammatory, and the idea of an impetuous military officer from abroad taking the stump and blazing away at Parliament and government is growing to be grotesque.

The demon of militarism does not possess him, the General say. But men often deceive themselves. He is now making a crusade against the supremacy of the civil power. Take the following paragraph from his Massey Hall oration:—

"All right thinking persons realize the vital importance of non interference with those high officials who administer justice between man and man; surely the defence of the country, the selection of the military leaders of the people are as important as the administration of civil justice, and the man who endeavors to do his duty in an impartial manner, in this respect, should have his hand strengthened rather than weakened."

This sounds very much as if the main function of the civil authority in this country was to back up General Dundonald in his military schemes. Why does he sneer at "some men" as "mere automata to carry out the behests of a particular political party?" He does not know that the spirit which breathes there, and in almost every paragraph of his address, is the truculent spirit of militarism. He does not seem to know that unswerving and instant obedience to the behests of a particular party is the form that constitutional government takes in Canada and in England. That's why Lord Dundonald was dismissed without a responsible man in Canada to say that he was not properly dismissed. He does not see these things any more than he sees that a particular party is egging him on to utter diatribes against the govern-

ment of a country which is neither his native nor adopted country.

It is in the same spirit that Lord Dundonald declares that Col. Ponton had "an undoubted right" to deliver a speech and criticize his superior officers on the headquarters staff. For that which General Dundonald says is undoubtedly right a British general was recently dismissed, for the purpose the Government said of making an example to all other officers. It is his same intolerance of constituted authority that led Lord Dundonald to say that on that occasion he stood "between the Minister and his prey." He has publicly acknowledged that he stood against discipline and against the enforcement of the King's regulations which prohibit a soldier from even writing to the press a letter on military matters, and these regulations, so indispensable to discipline are copied into the regulations governing the militia of Canada. The General justifies the insubordination of an officer on the ground that a militia officer is "a free citizen of a free country." That is mere rodomontade. A free citizen of a free country cannot break the law. Col. Gregory wrote an insubordinate letter to the District Officer Commanding stating that he resigned. The first act of the Acting General Officer Commanding was to telegraph that Col. Gregory's letter was grossly insubordinate in tone, that he be suspended from the command of the 2nd Dragoons, then in camp at Niagara, and given his passports home. That does not make Col. Gregory any the less "a free citizen of a free country" any more than a summons to the police court which asks a free and independent citizen why he kept a dog without a license. Lord Dundonald is talking through his hat.

The situation created by his Toronto speech seems to be fully understood in England, judging by the following despatch, dated London, July 18:—

John Henniker Heaton, M. P. asked the war secretary whether the name of Dundonald appeared on the active list of the war department and whether his services had been dispensed with by the Canadian government; also whether it had come to