

at the head of a splendid majority, a united majority, as the gentlemen opposite have found to their cost. I want to tell these gentlemen opposite that they are not talking by the book when they say that the farmers do not want their sons to go to these cadet camps. We have the evidence in our possession that not only the people of the cities, but the country people as well in every part of the Dominion—in the province of Quebec more than anywhere else—are anxious to have their children go to these camps. I am pleased beyond measure to see the line these gentlemen opposite are taking, because from their own view point they are making a fatal mistake. I was more than surprised to find our good friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), who poses as the champion of labour in this country, taking the stand he did. Let me point out to him that in a country where the labour leaders are honest, where the labour leaders are not afraid to stand up for what they think is right, in Australia, where a labour government is in power, a cadet system has been established and 75 per cent of the cadets are armed and well drilled and trained to shoot. In Australia, every man and boy from the age of ten years up must be by law trained to be a soldier. That is not militarism. Militarism is where a class created in the community holds control of the military power so as to dominate the rest of the people, but when you get a whole people trained for the defence of their country, it is the very antithesis of militarism.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Don't look at me in that way.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I believe that at heart the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is right, but unfortunately he has been keeping such bad company that he hardly knows where he is at himself. Discipline does not mean oppression; military training means honour, culture, upbuilding, training the youth to keep his head erect, and training him to keep his head erect is training him to keep his character right. The records of all countries show that where young men are trained in military work they are improved mentally, morally and physically. As an asset to a nation, outside of any question of the defence of the country, it is well to train the youth of the country in military discipline.

When the nation is in danger and its men are untrained, what is the consequence? They take to the woods and leave their wives, their mothers, their sisters, their daughters and their sweethearts to the tender mercies of the invaders. There is a record in every land where the men have been untrained. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen who have nothing to

gain but a little cheap popularity, to criticise the defence of the nation. Too long, I fear, have the militia estimates of this country gone through with the suspicion that everything was not right in them. I want our militia estimates to be subject to the fullest criticism, and I have taken pains to have full information regarding them sent to every locality in Canada, so that the people will know where their money has gone and what it has gone for. I want the people to know the exact condition of affairs, and I am confident that they will say: We do not believe in militarism, but we do believe in defending our homes. They will say: Patriotism and loyalty are splendid things, but loyalty untrained is worse than cowardice. It means that you have the spirit to resist aggression, but not the training to do it. Loyalty untrained is useless. A loyal regiment untrained is worse than baggage. A lot of loyal fellows carrying rifles means only so much cost to the nation; they are not fit to fight in any way. It means more than that; the expense is greater, the danger is greater. A few men trained in a nation are worth a whole regiment of untrained loyal men. The days of standing armies have gone, because they would have to be so large that it would be impossible to pay for them, and the people dread them. The old Saxon days have returned, when the whole nation must be armed; and the cheapest way to secure this is by training the youth of the land to handle a rifle just as we teach them to read and write and cipher. I was surprised to see the so-called labour leader in Canada taking the position he did, when the true labour leaders of Australia insist on every man in that country being trained to be a soldier, and on every boy over ten years of age—not optional, as I make it, on the part of their parents whether they shall go to camp or not—but forced to be trained in military work, forced to take a rifle and practice target shooting, forced to give their time and to some extent their means in developing themselves for the defence of their country.

Mr. CARVELL. One would almost think, in listening to the impassioned appeal of the Minister of Militia, that the suggestion made by one of his war lords at the conference which was held here before Christmas, that conscription should be established in this country, had made an impression on the mind of the minister. I hope the day will never come when we shall have conscription in Canada and every man will be forced into the army to be a trained soldier. What do we want an army for? We are not living in France or in Germany, or in Russia, or in Australia.