

of discipline alone. In this particular case the enquiry involved a charge of fraud made by certain officers against the colonel of the regiment, and a charge of insubordination and slander against the officers; it involved the question as to whether the colonel had defended the regiment or whether the officers were telling what was untrue and libellous. That is not a question of discipline, but a question affecting the standing and character of the colonel and the officers respectively, and the enquiry into this should not be concluded in a sort of Star Chamber Court. The hon. Minister went further. He said there was no wrong done; but there have been complaints of wrong, and we cannot see whether there is any wrong or not until we have an opportunity of seeing the evidence. The Toronto press ventilated the matter; and a subsequent enquiry, which was granted, appears to have resulted in the reversal of the decision at the first enquiry, for the officers dismissed under the first enquiry have been reinstated. The House has a right to know what is done by these Courts of Enquiry. This is a matter which concerns the civil standing of the persons, not merely their military position. There was an action entered against the *Globe* for having reiterated the charges preferred against the colonel and the latter failed to prove his case. There were heavy damages involved; and this shows that there were matters involved altogether outside of a question of discipline. If my withdrawal of this motion would be construed into an acquiescence of the principle laid down by the hon. Minister, I should not feel justified in withdrawing it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is at liberty to take his own course; but I think he would do well to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend to my left. These motions are always resisted in England, not only in matters of this kind relating to the regular army, but to the militia and volunteer and yeomanry forces, for this reason: that a military force is to be governed by military precedent and discipline; and questions affecting the force should not be dragged into the political arena. In this case nobody complains. The hon. gentleman takes action on his

own motion with a creditable desire to institute an enquiry. In England such motion would not be made. If any person—any soldier or officer—is aggrieved, he has a right to come to the grand inquest of the nation, and lay his petition before Parliament. If any British subject shows that he is entitled to redress, he can get redress; but there is no suggestion of that kind that there is any complaint of a grievance.

MR. CASEY: Yes, there is.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD: There is no petition. We could only know of a grievance by petition. In a matter affecting Col. Shaw, and affecting other persons, the subject was discussed fully. The hon. member for Centre Huron discussed it fully, and by universal consent of the House, it was understood that these matters should not be dragged into Parliament, or into the political arena, unless a person presented a grievance for which he could get no redress except through Parliament. If every soldier, every officer, sergeant, corporal, or private, can rush into the House, through a member, asking for liens by means of a motion, and for whom he has voted, perhaps, why all discipline, all training, all is gone. In this case there is no person complaining. I know something of the circumstances. I have had correspondence about it with gentlemen who felt aggrieved. They, however feel aggrieved no longer. I think the hon. gentleman should take the advice offered him and withdraw the motion.

MR. CASEY: By permission of the House, I rise to say that I consider that the right hon. gentleman has put it too strongly in leading to the supposition that my motion involves a question of politics. It is quite a different sort of matter, and it is not either an interference with discipline. I do not appeal to the House to change anything in the matter. I do not ask a change in the decision of any superior officer, but that publicity may be given to everything done in these Courts of Enquiry; they should not be held in a hole and corner fashion, and it is only on the understanding that I do not acquiesce in the principle laid down that these Courts should be thus privileged from having their proceedings made public, that I will consent to withdraw my motion. If, as the hon. gentleman says, the parties