

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Development.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, the line of development. We are pursuing the co-operative plan, and we want to pursue it still further in connection with the mother country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Have we not had changes in our boundaries?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May be, I am not very well up in 'geography,' but I do not see where Canada has won or lost any territory—or at least, where Britain has lost any. Canada does not own any territory. Britain owns this country. It was British dollars and blood, not Canadian dollars and blood, that bought and won this country, and I fail to see that since then it has won or lost any territory. People in Canada have a perfect right to hold independence views if they choose, and some may wish to see Canada annexed to the United States; but I am convinced that the great heart of Canada is in favour of a still closer union with the motherland, by which we shall become full partners in the concern, taking our fair share of its burdens; not content to spend simply 40 to 50 cents per head per year on the militia but not a cent on its naval defence, when every other country with a shipping not half of what Canada has, spends millions on its navy. If we were full partners in the concern, we would have all the advantages that belong to a co-operative society in business. We would have that prominence which has characterized Great Britain through the centuries, when the map of the world and the history of the world shows that all other nations have been the victims of chaos and disintegration.

In conclusion, I may point to this fact, that with such a union there would be an object lesson that would guarantee the peace and prosperity of the world, as that could be accomplished by no other union. In various countries we have heard of massacres of human beings within the year. In the Soudan, in the ten years preceding the British occupation of that country, upwards of 3,000,000 people were butchered in cold blood. Since Britain has taken possession of the land, the country has prospered, the expenditure has been far more than met by the revenue, and Canada as well as Britain has become interested in the trade of that country. The United States has brought the Philippines under the sway of civilization and modern government. Great Britain, united with her colonies, and standing shoulder to shoulder with United States, which I would like to see, could dictate terms to the people of any country who would tyrannize over their fellow men.

Take the case of Turkey, upwards of 40,000 people have been butchered in Turkey

within twelve months, yet Europe stands idly by unable to interfere on account of the jangling and quarrelling of European nations among themselves. But if Britain and her colonies were united and standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States, they could dictate to the Sultan of Turkey or to the government of any country that persecution must cease within the borders of that country, and that would undoubtedly at once put an end to it. Many years ago when amid the old Alpine mountains persecution was rampant, a message was sent by Cromwell—and the power of England was then not nearly so great as it is to-day—that if the persecution did not immediately cease, English cannon would be heard and English soldiers would be seen, not in the Swiss mountains and Alpine hills, but in the streets of Rome and under the walls of that city, and on the receipt of that message persecution at once ceased. In like manner, if the civilized powers of the world, if Britain and her colonies alone, standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States, would take concerted action, that would bring about a condition of affairs which would make for the peace and prosperity of the world and put an end to these expensive wars.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the motion.

Mr. TALBOT. I draw the attention of the chair to the fact that there is no seconder to the motion.

Mr. INGRAM. There is a seconder and as good a man as the one who raised the point.

Amendment (Mr. Tisdale) negatived on division.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN. I have an amendment to move, and before doing so I shall make one or two explanatory remarks. In so doing, I shall not follow the example set by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), but will take up as short a time as possible in explaining the object I have in view. I propose to move that sections 79, 80 and 81 be struck out and another section substituted. These sections provide for the calling out of the militia of Canada in the case of a riot or disturbance. Under them the militia can be called out at any time by three justices of the peace sending a requisition to the district officer commanding. Such a request compels that officer to send the militia to the locality where the disturbance either occurs or is expected to occur. I do not think that such power should be given to three men who are not responsible to any one. Both in the United States and Canada, the militia have been called out when there was no particular need for their services. There is, for instance, great difference of opinion as to whether the militia was really needed at Valleyfield. It was certainly called out against the protest of the civil authorities. There