

this has been arranged than if I went into the smaller items which require explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The first step to be taken in all these cases of gratuities and pensions, is to have the report of the medical examiners upon them. In the case of death we consider the circumstances of the parents, or those who are to receive the money. As in the case of Swinford, the father and mother may be altogether dependent upon their son for their livelihood, and this explains the difference in the awards. Of course the regulations concerning gratuities and pensions apply to all cases alike but we always take into consideration the special circumstances of each case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must observe that \$730 a year to the father of a deceased officer is a very large allowance, although it may be justified, and it is doubly large when you only allow one-third of that sum to the mother of a deceased officer of a superior rank.

Mr. WATSON. I had the pleasure of knowing both these young men. The families are similarly situated, but I believe that the father of Swinford has a position from which he draws a fair living. I think the discrimination that has been made between them is not justifiable. So far as bravery is concerned Captain Brown was one of Boulton's best scouts, and it is strange that his mother should only receive \$250 pension while the other should receive \$730.

Militia—Military Properties, Contingencies, &c. \$32,142 20

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In order to remove any doubt I desire to ask the Minister of Militia if I understood his statement correctly on the position of the officers. There are two classes of officers in the service: One appointed after a certain five years rule, said to have been established a few years ago; the other class was appointed before, I believe. The House on both sides recognised that when a certain age, to be determined by the Government, and which I believe is sixty-three years, is reached then the propriety of retirement is recognised. What I want distinctly understood is this: Do hon. gentlemen intend, at the expiration of these term of five years, to dispense with the services of the officers who were appointed prior to the introduction of the five years' rule, and who are not yet sixty-three years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have already explained to the hon. gentleman that the policy followed by the Department is, that those appointments are made for five years only. As to the cases of Colonel Denison and Colonel Milson: Although this change of policy applied to them, it was considered from the fact that when they were appointed no such rule was in existence, there should be a difference made in their favor. The officers who occupy a similar position will have a precedent in that case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand the position is this: that with respect to officers who were appointed prior to the five years' rule spoken of, that until they have attained sixty-three years, the Government do not intend to apply this rule of removing them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Ocean and River Service.....\$18,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister was to state whether the contract with the Allan Line Steamship Company had been completed.

Mr. McLELAN. The old contract required one year's notice to terminate it, and that has been given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what the Government propose to do. Do they propose to

invite public tenders or renew the contract on certain conditions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have given notice of termination of contract with the Allan Steamship Company, in order to be able to obtain an improved service on the St. Lawrence.

Canals—Maintenance and Repairs..... \$497,024 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg leave now to ask the question of which I gave notice, but which was not reached, that is, Whether the raising of the dams upon Mud Creek, at the outlet of Mud Lake, in the township of Bedford, was done by the authority or with the privity of the Government, or of any official of the Government?

Mr. POPE. No, it was not.

Militia—Permanent Corps, &c..... \$135,700 00

Mr. MULOCK. I had the honor to present a petition to this House a short time ago from a gentleman named Browning, and I desire briefly to state what it set forth. It alleges that Mr. Browning was appointed provisionally as lieutenant, and served in the North-West. It was intended that he should obtain a certificate from the military school at Quebec, but whilst the rebellion was in progress he could not attend there. Of course I am now only speaking of what appears in the petition. It appears that he discharged his duties in the North-West satisfactorily, and when the rebellion was over he accompanied the troop to Quebec, and there entered upon the course of study to which the law entitled him. At that time the school was in an unsettled state, in consequence of the rebellion, and it is stated that no squad was formed whereby he could receive such instructions as the law entitled him to, until the 15th of October, although he had been in attendance for a long time. The petition goes on to state that in the month of November he was making enquiry at the school with a view of taking advantage of the privileges to which he was entitled of having a horse kept in the school. He says that he then learned for the first time that the commandant of the school had been drawing rations for his horse, charging them against Browning without his knowledge or consent. The petition states that the commandant thereupon conceived the advisability of getting rid of the petitioner, and that day he received an order from the commandant to present himself for examination on the 6th of November. He thereupon replied by letter, stating that it was not reasonable to ask him to present himself for examination on the 6th of November, inasmuch as he had not had the instruction to which the law entitled him. The law entitled him to a course of twelve weeks' instruction at the school, and during that time to thirty-six lectures in all, distributed over the period, or an average of three a week. It also entitles him to certain practical work in command of the troop. It appears that on the day he was notified to present himself for examination, he had not had up to that moment any opportunity of command of a troop, although according to the course of instruction he was required to pass an examination in that branch of the service. The reply he received from the commandant was to the effect that he must either obey the order and present himself for examination on the 6th of November, or accept his transport, which meant, of course, to leave the school. He replied that to force an examination under such an alternative was simply to summon him up to be rejected, and accordingly he intimated that if that were the final decision of the commandant, he might accept the latter alternative at once, and he at once took his transport. Thereupon the commandant, instead of adhering to his first decision, informed him that the examination would not take place, but that he must await further orders. He accordingly remained at the school, and after getting the