

man—I would rather have a fighting sergeant from one of the regiments, than my hon. friend from North Toronto with all his knowledge and experience.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may be permitted a word I would just say that I should sincerely deplore it, from a patriotic standpoint, if by any means this speech of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) should become known on the other side of the line; for they would certainly send a commission to yank him over there and take command of their forces.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I do not know that my speech would do more damage than that of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). I regret that I was not here yesterday to hear the words that fell from the lips of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). But I suppose I have had a partial repetition of them to-day by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. W. Roche). Now, this Bill is to bring before us a proposition to increase the standing army of Canada to 5,000—that I understand is the proposition in a nutshell.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To increase the permanent force.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In so far as the increase is rendered necessary by the acquisition of Halifax and Esquimalt, I may say that I endorse it. I have formerly stated that I would much prefer to see the Canadians constituting these garrisons sent to Gibraltar or Portsmouth or some other part of the empire, and that the British regulars might still have remained in control of these centres. However, it is not necessary to enter into a discussion of that aspect of the case, I have presented my views on that subject on a former occasion. I am more and more a believer in a full partnership union of Great Britain and her colonies, and until we become full partners in a political, in a commercial and in a military organization of the British empire some arrangement, possibly the same arrangement, must be continued in force, and our assistance to imperial defence will be more or less auxiliary rather than co-operative.

Now, I have always opposed, as the House knows, any large standing permanent force in the country. The permanent force occupies three positions. It is here as an educational institution, which is undoubtedly its primary object, or supposed to be. Now let us take the educational establishments in the city of Toronto. There are universities and high schools in that city that train upwards of 6,000 students. In those educational institutions the professorial staff and assistants of every description, do not number anything like as many as do the officers, instructors and men of the permanent military institutions in

the city of Toronto; and the cost of the maintenance of the educational institutions of Toronto for training upwards of 6,000 young men, is nothing in comparison with the cost of training these militia officers and men in the country. Then in addition to being schools of instruction, the permanent force is also used as a police force. Well, Sir, I am on record in this House for many years as against the use of the militia of this country as a police force. I maintain when any municipality has been organized, the government should insist upon its preserving law and order within its own boundaries, and that the militia should not be called upon in any sense except in case of actual civil war, or a condition verging upon it, when the municipality absolutely loses control; then only should the militia be called out. I object furthermore as a taxpayer in my own locality where the people are all law-abiding, I object seriously to having a permanent force in this country which can be shipped around from point to point to do police duty. That is not what the men were enlisted for, that is not what they were intended for. When these municipalities have a little local riot in their midst, they call out the volunteers and pay them 50 or 75 cents each per day, whereas if they had to engage constables they would have to pay them \$2 or \$2.50 a day. Take a young man out of a dry goods store, for instance, and send him away to do military duty, and you only give him 75 cents a day, or possibly less; whereas if the municipality had to engage that same man as a special constable, they would have to pay him \$1.50 or \$2 for being used in that way. Therefore, I say, I am opposed to our permanent corps being used as a police force.

Then there is another aspect in which we should regard the permanent corps for defensive purposes, that is as a sort of nucleus of a centre whence we can get instructors in a sudden emergency. There is a good deal to be said on that aspect of the case. I do not know but that I would be willing to sanction a certain amount of increase in the permanent force provided we could not attain a similar object in a better way. But there must be no spasmodic system about the militia. There should be a military system in this country so organized that it would go on from year to year and generation to generation, automatically so to speak, and that we would not be called upon in case of emergency, to get a little rush on for a year or two and then fall back again into the old routine. How is it that our force is now kept up to its present position, to a large extent? Why, it is by the self-sacrifice of the officers, officers who have paid their own money for training, who give their time in the annual camp, give