

gard to the rights of members of the force with respect to invoking the aid of the representative of their county in getting compensation when their horses have been killed or injured, is one which is confined merely to cases of that character, because a very dangerous line is drawn there. Does my hon. friend mean to say that if a question of discipline arises in a camp that the militia men affected must not go to the military authorities in the way as laid down in the military regulations, but must go to a member of parliament for his support, and that he can practically tell his superior officer that he does not need to pay any attention to him, but that he will get his member to bring the matter up in parliament? Surely the minister does not go that far?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I will say this much: If a soldier in camp loses his horse and the matter is reported upon by the board, the proper course has been followed, he will get justice. The case pointed out by the member for Carleton, which is I trust, a little overdrawn—

Mr. CARVELL. It is not overdrawn. I can tell the minister that I actually paid money out of my own pocket towards the settlement of these claims.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In case a young man cannot get redress through the regular military channel, and in case red tape procedure would prevent him from taking proper action, I want to proclaim far and wide that when a young man doffs his uniform and returns to civilian life, he is a free man, and has a right to appeal to his member of parliament, or the Minister of Militia, or any other man he chooses, and there is no power under the law to say otherwise to him. Let my good friend, who is a lawyer, read up the law and he will admit that what I say is correct.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister knows very well that there are a great many laws in the land which are more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But the law is clear.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister knows that, and he knows very well the traditions that exist in the militia in this country. If the course suggested by the Minister of Militia to obtain a remedy is followed it will amount to a very grave breach of discipline. Because all that a man needs to do who has got a political pull is to tell his superior officer he can go hang. He can say that he will get his member to bring the matter up in the House and get after the officer. If the

powers of the Militia Council, or whatever body has control of the militia of this country, are not adequate they ought to be made broader. The minister is really going too far.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sorry not to have won my hon. friend's approval because I have been sitting up nights trying to do that. What I say is that if a young man fails to obtain redress, after the matter has been brought up in camp and has gone through the legitimate military channel—

Mr. MACDONALD. He must do that first.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly I have said so. In case he fails to get justice after having done that, I will give it to him. Justice is what we are most concerned with, that is what these young men want, and I will see that they get it.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister is now laying down a new law.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No. Not a new law.

Mr. CARVELL. If a young man takes the matter up in a proper manner in camp and a board is convened and finds that the horse for which claim was brought is not injured, and the young man comes here—accompanied by the veterinary who said he was satisfied the horse was injured—will my hon. friend allow him to urge his claim through a political or business channel, or let it go back to the board?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I must correct my hon. friend. I am not a lawyer, although I have two distinguished lawyers questioning me at the present time, and I am much surprised to hear one of those lawyers admitting there is a law on the statute-book, while the other says that I am laying down a new law. I am not laying down a new law, the law is there on the statute-book of Canada.

Mr. CARVELL. A new interpretation of the law sometimes has the effect of a new law.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no new interpretation. This has been the practice for many years and I cannot grasp the point of the hon. gentleman's argument about a political channel. I can assure him that if justice has been denied there no red tape will be allowed to stand in the way. If any new evidence can be adduced it will be brought before a new board which will settle the matter whether it goes through an official or non-official channel.

Mr. CARVELL. Then I understand the claimant will not get redress from the min-