

ing not to enable us to interfere, but absolutely to prevent us from interfering, no matter how dire the need might be. If there were any danger to be apprehended from leaving the law as it is, one could understand it; but the hon. gentleman has not attempted to show that there is a danger. When was any question ever raised under the law except in regard to the South African war? And yet at that time what did the people of Canada say? Why, the government were actually kicked into sending assistance to the empire in South Africa. That is the fact, hon. gentlemen know it, and this government want to put themselves in the position that they cannot get another kick of the same kind.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At the time of the Egyptian war the Conservative government would not send a man.

Mr. BARKER. The Postmaster General does not attempt to answer what I have just said. His reply is the reply of the little blackguard in the street who puts his finger to his nose and says: You're another. Is it not time to have that sort of thing stopped in this country? Suppose the Conservative party did fifty times what the hon. gentleman and his colleagues sought to do in 1899, is that any excuse?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It shows how insincere the hon. gentleman's remarks are.

Mr. BARKER. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman. I can only say that I stand here to justify myself. The hon. gentleman was in parliament on both occasions. He had the opportunity in 1899 of knowing how wrongfully, according to his opinion, his opponents had previously acted, and instead of taking warning by their errors, he simply followed a bad example. I do not propose to do that, and if the Conservative party had done tenfold wrong—

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman would endorse it.

Mr. BARKER. I say I am prepared to do right now, and as far as I can, I will try to compel the hon. gentleman to do right. Now, I say, that the old law has worked no harm. Hon. gentlemen opposite admit that in 1899—

Mr. BOURASSA. I rise to a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but for a long time I have felt that this whole discussion was out of order. Clause 77 of the Bill has already been adopted by the committee over two weeks ago. The motion proposed by the Minister of Militia is a new clause, and we have no right to discuss a clause which has already been adopted.

Mr. BARKER. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is an amendment before you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Sir Frederick Borden moves to amend the Bill by inserting a new clause entitled 77a after clause 77, and that is the question before the committee at the present time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does that not include the words 'for the defence of Canada,' to which the hon. member for Hamilton is taking exception?

Mr. BOURASSA. I respectfully submit that the question of the defence of Canada in clause 77 has been settled by this committee. Of course, I know that there are other means of bringing up the question again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to suggest that when an amendment is proposed, that amendment may have a bearing on other clauses which have been passed and may have to be reconsidered; and all that is necessary to put a member in order is to move the reconsideration of the other clause.

Mr. BARKER. The same words are introduced into the two clauses. If you omit them from this, you will probably have to go back and omit them from the other. Therefore one cannot very well discuss the amendment without discussing the two clauses together. The whole question must be discussed as one question. If the words 'for the defence thereof' are not in this amendment, the whole law must be changed. I object to these words as absolutely unnecessary according to the statement of the Minister of Militia himself. He is conveying not only to the empire at large, but to every other people, that Canada has laid down distinctly in its statutes that it will never use its militia except for the defence of Canada.

That is what I object to in the words proposed by the Minister of Militia. If we are to say openly to the world that we will never do anything with our militia, under any circumstances whatever, except for the mere defence of our country, why do we belong to the British empire? Are we to receive support from the British navy? Are we to live under the British flag? Are we to refer to this statute to the British empire or the King of Great Britain, and while referring to the King of Great Britain, and over again—much as we have done to eliminate him from the statute—are we to say, that under no circumstances whatever, shall we intervene in a British war except for our own selfish purposes? No matter if the British empire were to be dissolved and crushed, we will remain still, we will never move, the government of Canada shall have no power even to call out for fifteen days the active militia, provided the emergency that has arisen is not one directly affecting our own Dominion. Surely every Canadian who