

and of the country to-night to the fact that we have over \$6,000,000 now asked for, and we must add half a million to that for the buildings which as the minister has said are provided by another department, so that we have over \$6,500,000 asked for this year, and I think there is not much hope of decreasing that amount. I will venture the statement that if this scheme is carried out as outlined by the minister in his speech to-night—and I am glad he did not cut it shorter because all of us have not had the advantage of seeing this very full statement of accounts and very good statement from the Militia Council, under the chief of the general staff, of the outlines of the proposed continuation and completion of that defensive scheme for the country—I am not at all prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman that he can carry out the scheme for \$6,500,000 or say \$6,000,000. He must not forget that it is fair criticism that less than three years ago he was just as confident that the \$3,500,000 would be sufficient. I then warned the minister that I was not as confident as he was that with that amount of \$3,500,000 he could carry out his plan as he had outlined it providing, with the reserve, a first line of defence up to 100,000 men. I reminded him then as I must remind him to-night that the very fact that he has been given such a free hand, the very fact that his political opponents from the time that he had entered into his office had given him a very easy time in the way of criticism, that both sides in the House had been wonderfully generous to him in the way of granting money, made the responsibility resting on him even greater. Let me say that to-night I am one of those who would cheerfully take the responsibility of voting even this large sum. At the same time I have my doubts whether he has proceeded altogether in a prudent way, with such prudence as I am of the opinion he might go. In a general way the criticism I make is that it seems to me, to use an old expression, to be rather putting the cart before the horse. I shall explain that presently. It is a fair criticism that he has changed and inside of three years is asking for more than double the amount of \$3,000,000 which he then said was sufficient. He may be able to give an explanation; an explanation may be possible, but yet it does seem to me that this enormous increase, this continuous increase and change in these schemes is alarming.

It is of a nature that I think the members of the House and the country as a whole ought to study carefully. I am one who am willing to vote liberally for these purposes. I think Canada has always been worth defending. The country to-day is on such a line of expansion, it has such vast capabilities, and its prospects are so bright and

sound and prosperous that we can afford to be very liberal in providing for as good a defence system of citizen soldiers as any country in the world should reasonably desire. But my hon. friend stated to-night in his opening remarks, truly and fairly, that under our former system, we were in a position to utilize the services of the trained officers of the imperial army, so that we largely escaped the expenses of a staff and many things of that sort. In other words, we trained our militia by means of the large experience of officers of the British army, so that while we had not the same personal control over them that we might have under other circumstances, our men were always able to give a good account of themselves. I am not going to criticise the new departure further than to say that the minister has, in my opinion, gone too fast, not making sure, as far as human foresight can do so, that the lines he is laying out are sound ones before asking us to go further. And here I want to say that, having offered my criticisms in regard to the Militia Council, and having been overruled, I intend, as far as I am able, to assist, in every fair and reasonable way, to develop that system, to see if we cannot make it better than I thought possible last year. The weakness of the hon. gentleman's scheme, which is now appearing, is that he is building too much on paper. He is providing for staffs of officers scattered throughout the country, without being able to explain to us how, in case of actual trouble, he is going to have the men forthcoming to meet the exigencies of the occasion. If we can create under and in connection with all these auxiliary establishments a force of men trained to shoot and to perform simple military movements, it will be a magnificent force, though the auxiliary establishments and staffs are large enough to defend Great Britain, where a large force of several hundred thousand volunteers exists to-day, besides 500,000 regulars at the least calculation. Now, I think too much money is being expended. I am not going to criticise the details, but am speaking generally. We have these stations, auxiliary forces and establishments on paper. They are crystallized, I think, fairly well; yet how many militiamen have we? We generally muster about 35,000 men in camp. This machinery is sufficient for 500,000. Now, it seems to me that before we are asked to grant \$6,500,000 for these 35,000 active militiamen and 3,000 permanent militiamen, the minister ought to show that he can muster the 100,000 he talks about. Three years ago, when this scheme was projected, General O'Grady-Haley, then in command, showed how it would work out. His proposition was, if necessary, to have some conscription. My hon. friend then failed, as he has failed to-night, to show where the men required to make up the full force would come from.