

but I say that this is no discrimination against Canadians, nor do I believe that our Canadian militia look upon it as such. Canadians are not conceited as a rule—although you will find some glaring exceptions—and I do not think you will find any Canadian pretending that an officer in the Canadian militia could possibly have the same opportunities of training to become a General Officer Commanding as are enjoyed by an officer in the British regular army. I hope that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) will not disagree with me on this point. That hon. gentleman is a colonel of a militia regiment and a very good officer, much appreciated by his own battalion and by the men of mine as well, and I am sure he will not say that he has had had as good opportunities of gaining the knowledge and experience which we look for in our General Officer Commanding than would a man have, whether from Canada or elsewhere, who holds a commission in His Majesty's regular army and has risen in the ranks through his own efficiency. And you must not forget that nowadays promotion can no longer be obtained by purchase in the British army, but must be gained by sheer force of merit. I am in favour of exacting a still higher qualification than that of colonel for the man who is to take charge of our forces. I think that he ought to have a rank above that of colonel. I think he ought to have the rank of a brigadier or general of a higher rank. And if the pay be not sufficient, I am prepared to take the responsibility of voting for an increase. When we increased the pay a few years ago, and very properly increased it, under my hon. friend's administration, we did so on the understanding that if possible we would get an officer from the old country of higher rank than that of colonel. Let me say further that the militia of Canada do not want this change. What they want at their head is a man possessing the best qualifications; and if the men and officers of our militia were not in fear of being disciplined for exercising the right of speech, you would have ninety-nine out of a hundred of them protesting against this change in this Bill. What we require at the head of our forces is a man who has had experience of war itself, and we can always find plenty of such, and very desirable ones, in the old country if we take the proper steps. Our force is good enough to have the best man that money can obtain. We are not afraid of rivals in this Canadian country. We are prepared to stand on our merits.

I propose here to briefly contrast the ministers new scheme or system with the new English scheme and point out some of the important matters in that connection.

I have briefly explained both these schemes. Sir, let us briefly examine as to their similarity. The English scheme is for a great regular army of 100,000 men—always

Mr. TISDALE.

under arms and maintained whether on a peace or war footing. The cost being the vast sum of \$175,000,000 per year. Efficiency and readiness being the first object at whatever cost.

Under seven great committees, each with different members, each with defined duties, some mixed but largely separate, and permanent organizations. In addition the three great departmental organizations of the adjutant general, quartermaster general and master of ordnance, any one of which latter three has more and larger duties and many times greater expenditure than the whole Militia Department of Canada. Each of them with sub branches and assisted by one or more committees. This 'plain plebian Canadian,' as he ostentatiously called himself the other night (though he has a Sir to his name), with a chief of staff, adjutant general, quartermaster general, master general of ordnance, deputy minister, and chief accountant, all to be nominated by himself and all to be under his control and direction, claims to have formed and constituted a system and organization for the management and control of our militia, on all fours with the great imperial one which I have briefly described.

Another misleading statement is that made by the hon. gentleman that there is no commander in chief in England. Technically he is within the truth, no doubt. There is no one in England known by that particular name. But in every one of these divisions there is a commander in chief as much as there ever was. The hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) may laugh, but a laugh is not proof. And I regret to see the hon. gentleman indulge in such levity. I am talking for the minority in this House. I have not a majority behind me to declare my words to be right, whether they be right or not. I speak here under a high sense of duty. Nothing else could have caused me to claim the attention of hon. members at this stage of the session. But this is a life-or-death question with us, this question of defence. Each one of these five heads of divisions in England is equal to almost any commander in chief he could get. The principle is the same. And, I want to tell the hon. minister further that every one of them is vested with all the powers, in a military sense, that, I claim, the General Officer Commanding has and ought to have whether he is a militiaman or whether he is qualified by being in the regular army. And I will bring proof of that presently. I know that the hon. minister has either not looked into this matter far enough to understand it, or that he must be trying to mislead us. Now, for the proof. This is from the report I have alluded to and upon which my hon. friend claims to have founded his scheme—

Page 10, section 10—

We strongly hold that the training and preparation of His Majesty's forces for war should