

Does he know that, in addition to the fact that the great commonwealth of Australia has precisely the same provisions upon its statute-book that we are putting upon ours that great commonwealth has persistently and determinedly refused to invest a single dollar of its money in a navy to go beyond the seas immediately surrounding Australia? Yet the hon. gentleman presumes to sneer at this government, and presumes to say that the slight alteration that is being made in this statute is something that is going to reflect upon the character of Canada. Well, Sir, in conclusion, let me tell him, repeating what I said this afternoon, that the loyalty of Canada and the power of Canada to aid the mother country are too well known to make it necessary to place any declaration upon the statute-book. The statute we have here and this provision of it is, as I have said, entirely in accord with the spirit of the militia force—it is that and nothing more. And the attempt of the hon. gentleman and others to prejudice the people of this country against this government, on this ground is unworthy of the hon. gentleman and of this parliament.

Mr. BARKER. I want to say one word in allusion to a remark of the Minister of Militia. He says I sneered at the First Minister. I alluded to the opinion expressed by the First Minister in 1899, when he said that the old Act, the one that is now in force, prevented the government sending the active militia out of Canada for any purpose not Canadian. I said that the Minister of Justice expressed the same opinion. I referred to these opinions when I asked the Minister of Militia, as I did ask, under these circumstances, what was the need of altering the law.

Mr. TALBOT. I ask the hon. gentleman what he meant when he said that the government, including the Prime Minister, had been kicked into doing what they did do.

Mr. BARKER. That is so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the Minister of Militia has read a statute apparently in conflict with something I referred to, I would like to read from a report of a royal commission on the militia and volunteers, which has been recently made public in Great Britain. This report was made under a Royal Warrant bearing date 23rd April, 1903. The second paragraph of the first division of the report is as follows:—

The function of the volunteer force has always been held to be the support of the regular forces in the protection of the United Kingdom against 'actual or apprehended invasion,' while that of the militia has been two-fold; this force having had the same duties as the volunteer force in the event for which the volunteers would be called out for active service, and further, having at all times come forward, and frequently been used, as a supplement to the regular army during war for garrison duties both

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

at home and abroad and even for field service abroad.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Purely as volunteers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I don't know about that. I suppose there must be some statute or some authority vested in the government which would enable that to be done.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, there is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And it was in that view I suggested that the militia of the United Kingdom might be sent abroad under the authority of the government or of parliament, because I had distinctly in my mind this paragraph which I had read not long before. It would appear therefore that there must be some statutory provision in the legislation of the United Kingdom beyond that to which the hon. gentleman has referred; otherwise the report of the commission, headed by the Duke of Norfolk, could hardly have been couched in the terms I have just read. They are very significant, because it says the volunteers are purely for the protection of the United Kingdom against actual or apprehended invasion.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Those words in the report 'having at all times come forward and frequently been used' would suggest that they themselves had volunteered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, they could not be sent beyond the limits of the country, it seems to me, without some statutory provision, without some vote of parliament at least. Certainly, it is perfectly plain that their use has not been confined to the defence of the United Kingdom. They have, as distinctly stated in this report, been used for garrison duty both at home and abroad.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. On their volunteering to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether they cease to become militia on becoming volunteers. The report may be ambiguous on that point; it certainly does not say so, because it distinguishes them from the militia all through; and with regard to the use to which the militia has been put, it is still distinctly spoken of as distinct from the volunteers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What is the meaning of those words 'on coming forward'?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That would seem to suggest volunteering.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the other hand, you would hardly suppose they would be regarded as militia if they ceased to have the status of a militia and became volunteers, or an integral part of the regular army. Of course there is nothing to prevent the men of the militia from entering the regular army.