

to support militia, or a permanent force for such incidents as occur in time of strikes. The condition is that in all those cases, if you want the service to be appreciated, it must be gratuitous, and the government must pay for the services. Suppose a strike occurs on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, in a district far distant from a town where there is a small municipality? Supposing the municipality has to pay for the service of the militia, it would amount to ten times the revenue of the municipality and perhaps more. But I do not want to go so far as that. I wish to sum up what I have to say in three statements. First, because the ports and harbours, according to the constitution, and according to the special law, chap. 47 of 57 and 58 Victoria, are under the control of the government, when they have been so designated by an Order in Council. Orders in Council have been passed in many instances, declaring that such port is a public port, and the consequence is that the port and harbour are under the control of the government. Consequently, vessels when in such a port or harbour, are not under the control of the municipality. They are under the control of the federal government. Shipping is under the control of the government. The goods which are in a harbour are under the control of the municipality. Very often they are from different parts of the country. When a riot occurs in a port or harbour the service which is rendered by the militia is a public service rendered to the whole of the country, and the whole of the country ought to pay for such service.

Hon. Mr. FORGET—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—And when a disturbance occurs in a port or harbour under the control of the harbour commissioners, the vessels are not under the control of the municipality, and the goods which are there to be protected are not under the control of the municipality, but even the place where the riot occurs is not a municipal property, and is sometimes the property of the government, or the harbour commissioners. So that, for all these reasons, I contend that when a riot or disturbance occurs in a port or harbour being the property, or under the control of the government or harbour com-

Hon. Mr. DAVID.

missioners, the municipality should have nothing to do with it. The government has a permanent force. They say when the municipality pays it, it is because the permanent force not being necessary, they are obliged to apply to the active militia. If the volunteer force is not sufficient to quell a disturbance, the permanent force must be called out. The permanent force must be increased by one thousand. I think with two thousand soldiers, the government will have sufficient force in such cases to do all that is required. Conflicts may occur between the municipalities and the government. I am sure there will be a great deal of friction, because the struggle between capital and labour will increase. We are only at the commencement of a big struggle between labour and capital, and the militia will be called upon under many circumstances to suppress riots, and there may be many cases of rioting and insurrection. Under such conditions nobody will contend that the government is not obliged to furnish the force necessary to suppress rioting and violence. There are many circumstances where there is not much difference between a riot and an insurrection, and very often a riot is the commencement of an insurrection. If the municipalities continue to be obliged to pay for the services rendered by the militia, I am sure before long it will happen that when a strike will occur in the harbour of Montreal, the municipality will refuse to call out the militia, because they will, with reason, say that they are not obliged to meet the expenses of such service, when these services are rendered in the interests of the whole country. If the House is not ready to accept the other amendment, which I shall propose to clause 86, saying that after the case is provided for in this paragraph, the municipality will have nothing to pay if you are not ready to accept the other amendment, I think this amendment will be useless.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I could not accept the other amendment, and I do not think the Senate is in a position to place amendments of that kind in a money Bill, attaching a penalty to the Crown, so that the Crown instead of the municipality, shall bear the expense.