

4

wants to relate to the Canadian people the differences between himself and the Government of Canada, we are bound to come to the conclusion that the true reason of the differences that he has had with the Department of Militia and Defence was simply that my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence would not be dominated. We thought at first, after the speech at Montreal, that the quarrel of Lord Dundonald was with my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, but we find by the paper which he has placed before the public, that his quarrel with him was only on the surface, that it was only a pretext, and that the real quarrel he had was with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence? What is the source of the difficulty he has had with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence? He says that he offered advice which was not accepted, that he made suggestions which were refused, that he made a report which was suppressed, and he says—in this I have no doubt he was quite earnest and quite sincere—that when he gave such advice, that when he made that report, and that when he offered those suggestions he had nothing in his mind but to serve the best interests of the militia of Canada. I have no doubt of that. I do not question the intentions of Lord Dundonald whatever. I am speaking of his actions. I have seen a little of Lord Dundonald and I am bound to say that I believe he is a man very much in earnest, and I would not presume to say anything which would impugn his honor or his intentions. But it must be admitted that a man imbued with the best intentions may not always be a safe guide or leader. This is not the first time that a man with the very best intentions has been led into a very wrong course, and if that gentleman gave my hon. friend the Minister of Militia advice which was refused, if he gave him suggestions which were not accepted, and if he made reports which were not thought advisable to publish, while I do not deny that his intentions were good, I believe equally that the intentions of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia were just as good as his own. What happened then was what very often happens. Upon every occasion of a disagreement between honorable men upon acts to be done, upon a policy to be followed, because one is in earnest it does not follow that the other is not as much in earnest, and because one is honest it does not follow that the other is not honest; but it follows that either one or the other is erring in judgment, that one is right and the other is wrong; and in a matter of this kind I would just as soon accept the judgment and intentions of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia as that of anybody else who may serve under him. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence has been eight years in office. I believe I am correct in this, although I speak under advice, that he has held that position longer than any one of his predecessors, and certainly whether he has held it as long or longer than any one of his predecessors, I think I am within the mark when I say that there is not one of his predecessors who has done as much for the militia as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence has.

How the G. O. C. is Appointed.

There is an impression abroad that the General Officer Commanding holds his commission from the Imperial authorities, that he is the delegate of the War Office. Nothing of the kind. We know better in this House; but, sir, I think perhaps, it would not be amiss if I were to quote the law on this subject so as to dispel an impression which exists in many minds. Here is the law on this point and it shows that the General Officer Commanding the forces holds his commission from the Canadian Government. The Militia Act, section 37, says:

There shall be appointed an officer who holds the rank of colonel or rank superior thereto in Her Majesty's regular army, who shall be charged, under the orders of Her