

permanent force is in every instance located where there is a district officer commanding. But I will be glad to consider the point, and put in some words that will meet such a contingency, the absence, for instance, of the district officer commanding from the country. But even in that case, some one will be acting for him.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is another point along similar lines to the one brought up by the leader of the opposition. Supposing a riot occurs in the city of Ottawa, the district officer commanding is here, but there is no permanent force here. I think the district officer commanding in this district has no permanent force under his command. What is he to do, and where is he to get them? Supposing a riot occurs where there is a major, or captain, or lieutenant, and the lieutenant has authority to call out the militia; how is he going to get the permanent force?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The effect of the law will be, I think, that the permanent force will only be called upon in the great centres of population, or at points where the permanent force is stationed. In the city of Ottawa there would not be time, perhaps, in the first instance, to call upon the permanent force. In the city of Toronto the permanent force is there on the spot, and will be the first called upon in the event of trouble. In remote country districts, or in the city of Montreal, perhaps, it will be impossible to utilize this force.

Mr. CLARKE. The power is vested in the district officer commanding, in case the requisition is served upon him, to call out the permanent force. It might be a serious thing to give power to two justices of the peace to call out the permanent force, who do not bear the same relations to the populace that the militia force does. I think it is wise to call for the service of the permanent force rather than of the militia. Has the district officer commanding any power in the matter? Has he any authority himself, and can he exercise any discretion as to whether he shall obey the orders of these two justices of the peace? Because I apprehend that cases might arise where it would not be wise or judicious to call out the permanent force unless the responsibility was placed with the Minister of Militia as the proper authority. I can apprehend that a case might possibly arise in which it would not be well that the calling out of the permanent force should rest entirely with two justices of the peace.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The district officer commands within his district.

Mr. CLARKE. Has he any right to exercise any discretion?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Take Toronto as a case in point—the district officer at Toronto commands the permanent force and the troops within that district.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the meaning of this section? He has no discretion except to call out the permanent force. I think it is a matter that should be very seriously considered. I should like to have an opportunity of discussing that question further.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be lots of opportunities.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence has given utterance to the very point that struck me when I spoke on that matter a day or two ago; that is the permanent corps are to be the force that are to be utilized in cities and towns, but that in rural districts the militia have to bear the discredit of turning out and suppressing riots. It is for that reason that when the matter comes up for discussion I propose fighting the whole business from start to finish.

Mr. TISDALE. It seems to me that the whole section, to be of any practical use, will have to be more definite. What I mean by more definite is as to who controls the permanent force, who controls the active militia and where the distinction is as to which shall be called upon. I think this is very important. I happened on one occasion in particular to be placed in a position where I had to act myself and it is a serious responsibility for any one to take upon himself to call out the force. You do not know what your powers are and it is necessary that they should be clearly defined so that prompt action can be taken in case of a riot suddenly breaking out. From reading that clause myself I could not advise as to where the power rests, or as to which force should be called out except in one case and that is where the permanent force is available. It is quite clear then because the machinery is simple. I think there should be some more definite description to help the civil officers who have the responsibility of starting the machinery in motion. When they once start it the military officers of the force must bring out the force for which they are responsible. You say that in a particular case the permanent force would be called out, but how are you going to determine as to whether the permanent force is available. Are you going to take into consideration the question of distance and other surrounding circumstances? I cannot read this section so as to be sure that the civil or military authority would be right in acting except in one case and that is where the permanent force is available.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understand my hon. friend to say that he wants a more definite statement in regard to the occasions upon which the permanent force shall be availed of and as to the occasions upon which the active militia shall be utilized. It seems to me that the wording of the Bill is clear enough. Let us suppose that