

plainly as on the other. I know the officers of the militia and the boys of the rank and file in the country. And I know that if there is one thing more than another that will increase the force and encourage the men who form it, it is a little sympathy from the staff, instead of so many orders. The men of active force ought to be able to feel that the members of the staff are their friends and brothers, instead merely those who order them about and find fault if they fail to do right or as the staff thinks right.

Now I would suggest to the minister that he revise these estimates and cut out unnecessary and not at present required expenditures, and then we will vote them more willingly. Put the officers and men into a condition that they can be mustered. Increased pay undoubtedly will help that along. Let a little more of the money be spent among the chaps who stand behind the guns, instead of upon those who invent the ways of organizing and teaching the troops. In the first place, drill them all. If we are going to have a force that is worthy of the name, have all the corps full, and a few over. I like the letters the hon. gentleman read. I say that in this country under free institutions, where general education prevails, we have a right to expect that our young men will volunteer in sufficient numbers to defend the country; if they do not, we shall have to try some other plan. But I am satisfied that under a proper system there will be no trouble. Then evolve your plans to have your 40,000 re-serve. Drill 60,000 men next year in the camps, and that will satisfy members of parliament who think on this subject, and feel on it as I do. I do not object to voting money if it is honestly and successfully expended on the militia. But do not let us have any more politics in the militia, not even a suspicion of politics. The Minister of Militia should be strong enough to turn down his fellow members of the cabinet when they attempt to interfere, and if he does that, he will have the support and respect of the members of this House. If we want a successful defence force, that must be done. I have supported the minister sometimes when I thought I was going a little further than I ought. I know he has had difficulties to meet, he has been unduly influenced. I have made these few general remarks because I thought they needed to be brought to the attention of the minister and of the government. If the country once gets the idea that militia matters are not improving, and that we are not working up as rapidly as we should to the consummation the minister has outlined, there will be a row about paying these large sums.

Lastly, I wish to speak of one more matter, with regard to which I am sorry to say I have to disagree with the minister,

and that is the taking over of the defences at Esquimalt and Halifax. I look upon that as a serious matter, and I am opposed to it from top to bottom. I think it is a mistake from a financial point of view, and worse than a mistake from other points of view. I am only expressing my own views on this matter, and I intend to express them frankly. I think I would be justified in saying that this action is a distortion of the principle of not voting money unless we spend it ourselves. We must remember that we are a colony of the British empire and not an independent country. Now I see no justification for this action on the principle that the government has laid down, the principle that for defensive purposes any money we vote or men that we arm must be under our own control. I say this action of the government in taking over these fortresses is a distortion of that principle. There are cases where the expenditure for defensive purposes is twofold, imperial as well as colonial, and those two parts afford the best illustration of what I mean. What is the use of maintaining them? Why, it would be folly for us to expend one dollar on either of those ports except as naval bases for the imperial navy, towards which we contribute not one cent. Nevertheless the whole power and strength of that navy is behind us, and we can rest easy, no matter what country may attack us, or I might almost say, no matter what combination of countries may attack us; because on the sea Great Britain is practically the mistress of the world. Great Britain, until very recently, paid all the expenses, manned, built, armed and maintained those fortresses. Latterly we have been contributing something to one or both. The minister explained that the Canadian government did not agree with the British government. The British government was satisfied if the Canadian government would put the militia into proper shape, they would accept that as a sufficient contribution. Then came the question, either at that time or subsequently, of the maintenance of these two forts, and the question of a direct contribution from this country. The British government, as I understand, stated that they would be perfectly satisfied if the Canadian government would contribute £200,000 sterling, \$1,000,000 a year, and the British government would continue, as they had done, to keep those forts in a state second to none in the world, paying all the expenses. Our government, as we all know from the minister, declined to do that and said: No, we will take them over and man and maintain them ourselves.

It is a distortion of principle and financially it is a loss to us because I am satisfied that \$2,000,000 a year is the very least we can calculate on for the expenditure