

very strong opinions against the sending of any Canadians volunteers out of the country, and questioned the right, under the clause which I have read here, from the old law, or the power to do so. Of course my hon. friend recollects that interview as well as I do, no doubt. Now while there might be supposed to be a doubt under the old law which says:

Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada.

Those who took a different view at that time contended that this gave the right to the government to allow volunteers to leave the country, even without the consent of parliament. The present Bill removes that power and authority, because it declares that they cannot be sent out of the country for the defence thereof.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, they can.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The Governor General may 'place the militia or any part thereof on active service in any part of Canada and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof.' The hon. gentleman is right, but the condition is that it must be for the defence of Canadian territory and not in aid of the imperial authorities, should their services be required.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—It is not for aggression or contest.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I admit it is not for aggressive purposes. When we assist in the defence of the empire, it is not a war of aggression. I do not know that there is anything in the law, however, that prevents a company, or men in a company, from volunteering for service abroad. I would much rather have seen the clause left as it is in the original. However, the wisdom of parliament thinks differently, and the fact that clause 71 provides for the assembling of parliament to obtain authority, removes the objection to a very great extent which I would have to the adoption of the clause. Having put myself on record on that point, I have no more objection to it.

The clause was adopted.

75

On clause 74.

74. The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's Regulations, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of Canada for the government of the militia, and every officer and man of the militia shall be subject thereto from the time of being called out for active service, and also during the period of annual drill or training under the provisions of this Act, and also at any other time while upon military duty or in the uniform of his corps upon or within any rifle range or any armoury, or other place where arms, guns, ammunition or other military stores are kept, or any drill shed or other building or place used for militia purposes, or during any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present in the ranks, when going to or from the place of drill or parade, and also whether in uniform or not at any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present as a spectator.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Could the hon. minister give us the meaning of that clause?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is very much the same in spirit as section S2 of the law as it now stands. That section provides that the active militia shall be subject to the King's Regulations and Orders for the Army.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—What is the difference?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—It looks about the same.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I find armoury and rifle range have been added. It goes too far. If a man is near a rifle range he falls under the King's Regulations.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—These words are added 'Whether in uniform or not.' He is to be held amenable to the King's Regulations if he is there, even as a spectator. Many volunteers go to witness the drill of their corps and go in uniform. Under the old law they would be amenable then to the King's Regulations, but this makes them amenable to the King's Regulations whether they are there in uniform or not.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—It is the same in the Act as it stands.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If he is a spectator in uniform all right; but if not, why should he be under the King's Regulations?

Hon. Mr. POWER—It does not make any change in the existing law.