

the militia to any part of the British empire doing it for the defence of Canada. The Governor General in Council should not have power to do that; that power should remain in the hands of parliament alone.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have had that power for a long time.

Mr. FOWLER. That makes no difference, we are now discussing this Bill which makes changes in many directions and the existing law can be changed as well in this respect. I do not believe in this centralization of power in the Governor General in Council. It would seem that every Act passed in this parliament now inclines to give more power to the government of the day. Parliament has no right to divest itself of its inherent powers; we are here as the representatives of the people and we should hold this power in our own hands,—

and a lot more to the same effect.

Mr. GOURLEY. If he said that, he ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. member for King's did not want the Governor in Council to have the power to send troops beyond Canada even for the defence of Canada. That was his position. What is ours? It is that we are prepared to give the Governor in Council a blank power of attorney extending over fifteen days. The Governor in Council may send the militia of Canada out of Canada at any time, when deemed necessary for the defence of Canada. If, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it should be necessary, because of a war going on in India, to send our militia out there for the defence of Canada, they may, in the exercise of their discretion, do it, because they are the sole judges of what is necessary to be done in defence of Canada. But we do not think it advisable that that power should be absolutely and unrestrictedly in the hands of the Governor in Council. We think it advisable that the period during which they may exercise that power should be restricted and that parliament should be called together and be consulted at the earliest opportunity. Parliament must be summoned in fifteen days and then the whole matter will be in the hands of the people's representatives. So far as we are concerned, it may be suggested that this is treason, and that we are separatists. But these are mere idle words which are being used for a purpose, and my hon. friends may as well understand that that purpose will not be served by all their vapouring, and that no sensible people attach the slightest consequences to their silly threats. Our loyalty does not consist exclusively of words and hot air. In the unpatriotic task in which my hon. friends are engaged, of endeavouring to create the impression here and abroad that the Liberal party, which represents the majority of the people, are a gang of separatists, they are simply holding themselves up to ridicule and no good purpose can be served by such methods. In any event, the position we take

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

is that the Governor in Council must be controlled by parliament and parliament alone can decide, after the Governor in Council has taken the first step, the extent to which our troops may be moved out of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is such a sentiment, what gave rise to it?

Mr. FIELDING. The statements of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. It could not be the action of the opposition, but must be the action of the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The words of the opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the whole of the Militia Bill. It first does away with the General Officer Commanding, which is one of the ties connecting us with the imperial powers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It does not do away with him.

Mr. SPROULE. It practically does away with it when we get the right to do away with it, and especially when we see the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite declaring that the last General Officer Commanding has gone away and that the sending out of a general officer commanding from Great Britain will never be repeated. Are we not, then, justified in concluding that the trend of events under this government seems to be in that direction? What interpretation do we put on the fact of the name of His Majesty being cut out so often from this Bill? Does not that seem to weaken the tie? A great many of the common people have so interpreted it, whether rightly or wrongly. But whose action gave rise to this belief? Was it the action of the opposition? It could not be; it was the action of the government. The Minister of Militia says that there is no necessity to advertise our loyalty by statute. But is it not better, by statute or in some other way, to let the world know where we stand and the power we possess as a portion of the British empire, rather than keep these things in the dark and make belief that we are not prepared to defend the empire? It is merely putting it in the statutes that the world may read it and know that our position in the British empire is settled. We are supposed to be loyal people and we have a flag, the glorious Union Jack. But should the day come when that flag is hauled down at Gibraltar, or on the Red sea, or in any part of the world, what will be our position? The battle deciding the fate of the empire, and so deciding the fate of Canada might be in a distant country, and defeat for the empire would be as much a defeat for us as though the disaster took place upon Canadian soil. Is it to be said that we who have in our hands the power to go to the