

be as free as the Lord intended they should be free; let them not be subject to petty restrictions from sergeant, corporal or officer, who may want to exhibit a little brief authority. Let these restrictions be removed; let the men, although soldiers, still be free men, and I am satisfied that there will be no cause for complaint on the ground of discipline. Discipline never was and never will be tyranny; discipline is education; discipline is polish; discipline is refinement—restriction is the reverse of all that. Although there are one or two points in this measure that might call for criticism, I am not criticising adversely, nor will I enter into any lengthy discussion at this late period of the session. I urge upon the minister the advisability of cutting down to the lowest possible point the permanent force and to spend the money in developing our youth and in training our rural lads, who go out once a year for ten days to do service for the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Although I have forfeited my right to speak, I hope the House will permit me to say a very few words. I think all will agree that the remarks which have fallen from the gentlemen who have just addressed the House are entitled to consideration. I am exceedingly glad that the opportunity has arisen for the House to hear the views of the hon. members for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and for Halifax (Mr. W. Roche). I do not disagree very materially with the remarks made by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), and, as he was not here yesterday to hear it, he will be glad to know that a special effort is to be made in the near future to arrange some common basis by which all the schools in the Dominion can be some how or other brought within the range of the influence of military training and rifle shooting.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said that he disagrees with our policy in taking over Halifax and Esquimalt, and, as I understand him, he disagrees from a sentimental point of view chiefly, because he states that he looks upon it as severing another link in the chain which binds us to the mother country. That has always been the story. From the earliest days, when this country began to agitate for responsible government, that objection has been offered. It was the objection offered last year when we amended the militia law, so that if we choose we could appoint a Canadian as commander in chief of the Canadian forces and be no longer bound to appoint an imperial officer. I do not think there is anything whatever in that objection. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked: Are we going to let Great Britain go? Certainly not. But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to let the tax-

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

payers of the British Isles get a little relief from paying the bills which Canadians ought properly to pay. That is all we are going to do. Is that going to disturb the sentimental or the real loyalty or patriotism between this country and the motherland? It certainly is not. Did the hon. gentleman reflect upon what the proposal of Mr. Brodrick was? Mr. Brodrick's proposal was that one in four—which would be 10,000 men in the Dominion of Canada—should be specially trained and equipped, and that it should be understood that these men should be set aside for oversea or foreign service, subject, of course, to the will of the parliament of this country. I repeat what I said yesterday, that I objected on the ground that I thought it was a pity to create any special force in this country, and that it would lead to jealousies between that force and the ordinary active militia. I am to-day still strongly of that opinion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that things could have been so arranged on those lines that there would have been a force ready in Canada in the event of a repetition of the occurrences in South Africa; in the event of Canada wishing at any time in the future to assist the mother country in a foreign war. Will not that end be even better served by increasing the efficiency of the militia generally? If such a crisis should arise, it would be necessary that there should be a volunteer force whether we train that special 10,000 for foreign service or not, because, under our law, we could not compel any of our militia force to serve abroad. Now we are perfecting, or trying to do so, our militia; and it will be much easier, I apprehend, in any time of future stress or trouble, to obtain a well drilled and efficient volunteer force out of the militia for such service than it was four or five years ago, when we had an opportunity of doing so, and did it so cheerfully. Therefore, I think that the objection of my hon. friend to our plan is not a real one. I think I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to say that if we were able to do so, he would be in favour of our giving a sum of money to assist in the maintenance of the British fleet. Well, Sir, it seems to me that it is infinitely better and infinitely more in accordance with constitutional methods that we should give that assistance by maintaining the naval bases at Halifax and Esquimalt, which have no other reason for their maintenance than the fact that they are naval bases. And naval bases for what? For the British navy. It seems to me that the difficulties of my hon. friend are answered at once. We are actually doing the thing he would wish us to do, and we are doing it upon Canadian soil, and we are doing it in such a way as to meet with the approval of all self-respecting, self-reliant Canadians; of all men who are unwilling that the British tax-payer, over-burdened now with taxes, should expend money for maintaining for-