

command. He went further still; he told us that the treatment which we had meted out to Lord Dundonald was harsh and cruel. How harsh and cruel? That it was painful to those who had to inflict it is undoubted; but if it could have been avoided, I confess I do not see how. We were told to-day that we might have done in the case of Lord Dundonald what was done in the case of Lord Charles Beresford. Certainly we might, if the cases had been alike. If, like Lord Charles Beresford, Lord Dundonald had apologized for his conduct, certainly we would have treated him as Lord Charles Beresford was treated. Lord Charles Beresford had written a letter which was published without his consent and he so declared. But Lord Dundonald went to Montreal for the very purpose of bringing on this scandal. Therefore, there was nothing to do but what we did. For our course we have abundance of authority in the mother country.

A Parallel Case—General Colville Relieved of Command.

Only two years ago, just after the conclusion of the South African war, General Colville had a disagreement with some of his brother officers. He was charged with not having done his full duty under certain circumstances in South Africa, and with having left a certain portion of the army in great distress, whereas, if he had been more active and determined he might have relieved it. The War Office took a lenient view of the accusations against General Colville. They did not dismiss him; they did not deprive him of his rank; they gave him a command in Gibraltar. But when General Colville had been given this new command, he made the great mistake of going before the public, of writing for publication in the press, commenting upon those who had brought the accusations against him. And what happened then? He was at once relieved of his command. The debate upon the subject is instructive. The War Office had taken a lenient view of General Colville's case. But when he sought to bring his complaint before the tribunal of public opinion, instead of laying it before the Commander-in-Chief, the measure of his offences was full. The matter was brought before parliament by Mr. Charles Douglas. I quote from the speech of that gentleman as reported in "Hansard," page 1251:

A very considerable prejudice had been created against General Colville by the fact that he had published in the newspapers a statement of his treatment by the War Office. He did not defend that action of General Colville's. It was most desirable and necessary that they should uphold and fortify the great traditions of army reticence. Sometimes it led to barbarism, but it was essential to discipline, and more than ever necessary now in view of the extreme activity displayed by the newspapers. He did not defend General Colville's action, but hoped the House would allow him to submit one or two considerations in regard to it. In the first place reticence could not be all on one side. If their generals were never to take means of vindicating themselves publicly, then he ventured to think that a little reticence should be observed by the War Office.

When General Colville returned to this country the first thing he saw was a newspaper paragraph which was obviously inspired.

Now mark the answer which was made by Mr. Brodrick, Secretary of State for War.

The question is whether a public stigma would have been put upon General Colville. That is what I wished to avoid. After that General Colville's action cannot be defended by any one. He left for England. He did not avail himself of his right of appeal to the Commander-in-Chief. He made no representations to the War Office. He immediately published what he called a justification, but which consisted rather of an attack upon the staff officers in the Transvaal; and which also included, I regret to say, what appeared to be some ungenerous sneers against the cavalry whom he had found impossible to relieve. And