

which are the property of the government. Do not forget this important point to show the distinction of a riot taking place within the limits of a town or municipality, and a riot in a port; the difference is generally that the riot takes place on government property, or on the harbour commissioners' property, which amounts to the same thing. As I said this morning, what is the object of calling out the militia at such a time? It is to protect the property of the government, to protect steamers, and all kinds of vessels, foreign shipping generally, which are under the protection of the government and not of the municipality. It is to protect goods which are not necessarily the property of citizens at the port, but are destined for other parts of Canada. Moreover, when a riot takes place under certain circumstances it generally is and will be on account of a question of wages, because of difficulty between the government and wage-earners employed on government works. Not in municipal works, but in government works. Why should the municipality pay for the militia, when they have nothing to do with the disturbance, when it is not due to municipal questions, and when sometimes the government is the cause of the riot, which is very often a question of wages, and the riot is provoked by men coming from all parts of the world, employed by the government, and contractors. Is it not unreasonable to say that in such a case the municipality will not be responsible for the payment of the militia? Let the government employ the permanent militia. The government is obliged to pay for the permanent force, so that the government will have no reason to apply to the volunteer militia in such cases. Although there is much more to be said on this question, it is sufficient to show to the hon. members of this House, that the question is more serious than it is thought to be by many, and I do not hesitate to predict, although I am not a prophet, that before long there will be friction and conflicts between the government and the municipalities on that question, very serious conflicts, very serious difficulties, because a riot may take place in a great port which is attached to a small municipality. The other ports are more interested than Montreal. It is said that this is intended speci-

ally for Montreal, but I am making this more in the interests of other ports of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose this motion is similar to the previous motion, that the Bill be sent back to a Committee of the Whole to make this amendment?

The SPEAKER—No. When this motion was rejected in committee, the hon. gentleman gave notice that he would move the amendment on the third reading of the Bill, which he had a perfect right to do. It can be done either way, but inasmuch as the hon. gentleman moved the amendment in committee, and it was rejected, he gave notice that he would move it at the third reading. I think the usual way is not to refer the Bill back to the committee under such circumstances.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I have another amendment to propose to another clause of the Bill; both might be taken together.

The SPEAKER—One at a time.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I think the hon. gentleman could move the two amendments together. Will he not lose his right to move a second amendment, if he does not move them both at once?

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I would not move the one, if I did not believe the other would be accepted.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—I understand this motion is similar to one made in Committee of the Whole, that the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles is desirous of moving a second amendment with reference to the payment of military forces, when they are called out, the payment to be made by the government. If he does not get the latter, he does not want the former. Would it not be more convenient if the House dealt with the two, if the House would deal with the latter amendment especially. I submit with all due deference to my hon. friend from Mille Iles that it is contrary to the rules and practice of the Senate to impose a clause of that kind in a Bill which will mean the expenditure of public money. I quote from Bourinot at page 626, if hon. gentlemen desire the authority.