

which is made to protect the rights of the municipality. I think this is one of the most important amendments suggested in regard to the administration of the Militia Act. The point the hon. senator from Mille Iles desires this honourable House to accept is that where a riot takes place on government property that the adjoining municipality on one side of the river or the other, on the east, west, north or south, shall not be called upon to pay the expenses of quelling that riot, and I think that the principle which the hon. senator has laid down is right and just. A riot takes place on government property, property on which the government pay no taxes to the municipality. Take the Lachine canal or the Soulanges canal, which are altogether government property, paying taxes to no municipality along the ten, twelve or fourteen miles of the length of that canal. A riot takes place, and the militia is called out to protect the property. Whose property? The government property? What municipality are you going to force to pay for the quelling of a riot on that property? You cannot force any of them. Why force a municipality on the south side or the north side of that canal to pay for such a thing? Why force the city of Montreal to pay large amounts for militia expenses incurred in the protection of government property, instead of forcing St. Lambert or Longueuil to pay for it? I say that the hon. senator from Mille Iles has asked us to place in this Militia Bill a principle safeguarding the rights of municipalities when the property which is protected by the calling out of the militia is government property. Take, for instance, the port of Montreal. There is a stretch of property and merchandise on that line and on those wharfs worth millions which does not belong to the city of Montreal, and with which its administration have nothing to do, which property does not contribute one cent towards the cost of the municipal administration of the affairs of Montreal. Why call upon the city to protect property which contributes nothing towards the city treasury? Why call upon the city of Montreal to pay out tens of thousands of dollars for the protection for which it is not responsible? If the House will accept this amendment with the other amendments, I will maintain the position

which I hold jointly with the hon. senator from Mille Iles; but if it is going to be an obstacle in the way of this Bill being adopted immediately and sent down to the House of Commons I would ask the hon. senator to withdraw his amendment at present for this reason: I have consulted with the minister responsible for this Bill and when the matter was laid before him he said we were right, and if it could be remedied by a Bill next year, it would be done. As a matter of justice and of law you cannot call upon me to pay money for protection of property which contributes no revenue to the city of Montreal. I could understand if the harbour commissioners were obliged to pay taxes on the full value of their property, that the city of Montreal would be obliged to afford them the protection which they afford to other citizens who pay taxes into the city treasury. But that corporation is a distinct corporation from the corporation of Montreal—and I suppose it is the same in all the ports—a distinct corporation who are not liable to the municipality for any taxes. It is not fair to sanction a principle which involves injustice, and if the hon. senator has confidence in the wisdom of the government and their desire to do right by the municipalities, and if it is the desire of this House not to accept the amendment to-day if my hon. friend is willing I would be content to have this amendment withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I withdraw nothing.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Then I stand with the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I would think it very unfortunate if we had to vote on this motion, when it is in fact incidental to the larger question involved in the second motion. If the second motion is objected to on a point of order, then the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles will withdraw that motion even if it were adopted.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—Not necessarily.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I thought the hon. gentleman said he did not care for the motion if it were not followed up by the other motion providing for a charge upon the public treasury for the maintenance of the militia while on duty.