

only for the defence of Canada, but for the defence of the empire and of her trade at any time.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think a matter of this kind should be discussed dispassionately on both sides. I do not consider that fireworks or declamations are necessary to the production of a convincing argument. The proposition before us is as to whether we shall place in the hands of the government the power to say not only that the militia of Canada shall be sent out of Canada in defence of Canada, but also that it may be sent to any part of the world in defence of the British Empire. I think the latter is too great a power to place in the hands of the government. If it is necessary surely the parliament of Canada, representing the people, should be the first body to determine whether or not the militia should be sent abroad to fight the wars of the mother country.

Let us be as patriotic as we desire, yet we know as reading men, we know as thinking men that these things have occurred in the past and may occur in the future, that the mother country may be the aggressor, and may enter upon a war for the purpose of aggrandisement or the acquisition of territory. Those days are not dead in the world. It is yet possible that Great Britain or any other nation may go to war for this purpose. Suppose that such a war should be declared by Great Britain, a war for the purpose of aggrandisement. Are we going to say that any government shall have power to say to the militia of Canada: 'You shall go forth to aid in that war,' even although we may believe it to be an unjust or unreasonable war? I say that power should be in the hands of the representatives of the people. The amendment of that section will still leave it in the hands of the people's representatives to decide whether or not our militia should go forth to take part in a war whether that war is or is not a war in which we as a part of the British empire are interested. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) has made the statement that he is frequently met with the question: Why do you not contribute something towards keeping up the British army or navy, contribute something towards the defence of the empire; you are doing nothing. Let me tell the hon. member that when the people of Canada are elevating the standard of the militia here, or when they will, as I hope they will in the near future, provide a certain coast protection by way of a navy, I say that we are contributing towards the defence of the empire. We are contributing just as materially and I claim we are contributing more materially towards the defence of the empire, when we elevate the standing of our own army than we would be by paying in dollars and cents so much into the British treasury which

might be expended elsewhere than in Canada. That I say is to my mind a sufficient answer to any person who makes the accusation that we are not contributing anything towards imperial defence. I do not think that any one in this House, I doubt if there is a citizen in all Canada who entertains the slightest doubt in his mind of the fact that when the time comes, if it should come, that Great Britain while engaged in a just war in a just cause needs the assistance of Canada she will only have to ask for it; aye, she will not even have to ask for it, the sons of Canada will be ready to offer their services as they did in the South African war.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not put it in the statute?

Mr. GALLIHER. Reference has been made to certain portions of this country as being indifferent to defence. I do not think that is a fair statement. I would call attention to the fact that of the very first quota of men that ever went from Canada to engage in the service of the imperial government some twenty years ago,—I refer to the expedition to the Soudan—three-fourths were French Canadians. I knew this personally, I know the class of men who were in that party. I will state that no abler, more energetic, more loyal or more faithful body of men ever left the shores of Canada than the contingent that sailed from Canada in 1884. I speak from personal experience, I speak because I know whereof I speak, I speak because I myself worked and slept side by side with these men, and I cannot permit any reflection to be cast by any hon. member of this House upon them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who said anything against them?

Mr. GALLIHER. It was read this afternoon.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not a word.

Mr. GALLIHER. I know whereof I speak, I heard it. I say that no statement of that kind should be made. Of course if it is done for political purposes—I will not say it is, for I suppose it would not be parliamentary for me to say it is—but if it is for political purposes, it may be one way of playing the game. Perhaps it is justified, but at all events it is unfair. The hon. member for Colchester differed with the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence as to the interpretation of the section of the old Act with regard to the meaning of the phrase 'either within or without Canada.' It appeared to be in his mind if I understood him correctly that under the Act as it stands now, the government could send soldiers to any part of the empire. There may be many others not only lawyers but laymen who may hold