

receives no real value. They are paid to officers who are incapable of imparting instruction, and who are unable to give sufficient attention to the arms under their charge. In the majority of cases, these allowances are looked upon merely in the light of perquisites attaching to the command of a battalion or company. The fault does not rest with the officers, but with the system, which makes an impracticable demand upon them. Considering the sacrifices made by officers of the Rural Militia in the performance of their militia duty, it appears absolutely necessary that certain allowances, in addition to the pay of their rank, should be granted to those who exercise the most important functions. Such allowances should, however, be the payment for a distinct value received by the country.

These are the allowances I had reference to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that refers to the very allowances I mentioned.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is not intended to do away with them during the present year; but having heard the views of my hon. friends on the subject, I will give it special consideration.

Mr. LISTER. They are not our views.

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. gentlemen will refer to sections 315 and 390 of the Militia Regulations, they will find that those allowances are fixed by statute. As I pointed out last year, the allowance for the care of arms is all right, but the allowance for drill instruction is wrong. The latter encourages old officers to remain on the force long after their usefulness has gone. The allowance for the care of arms should remain, and the allowance for drill instruction should be abolished.

Mr. LISTER. The allowance for the care of arms should, I think, be given to some one who will look after them. I understood from the Minister that it was to be abolished, but I did not understand what, if anything, was to be substituted.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I did not intend to convey the impression that the allowance to captains for drill instruction, referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, would be abolished. It is not the present intention to do away with that system, but it is under consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I asked the Minister a little while ago what explanation, in detail, he had to give the committee of the contemplated changes of the staff, because the Major-General, in his report, seems to place great stress upon the reorganization of the staff. He quotes from his published report of the previous year, the following paragraph:—

I am thoroughly convinced that if the country is to receive an adequate return for its militia expenditure, a reorganization of the staff is necessary. The first step in that reorganization should be the more strict definition of the duties and responsibilities of the Major-General commanding the Militia, on the principle contained in Her Majesty's Order in Council, appended to the Queen's Regulations for the Army.

This should be followed by the distribution of the staff, in such manner as to ensure the proper performance of the duties and the maintenance of an efficient chain of responsibility.

Then he goes on in his report of this year to say:

I have submitted details of a scheme for the reorganization of the staff by which I propose to gain economy in administration, combined with the systematic instruction of staff officers in those important branches of their duty which have been hitherto ignored. I venture to hope that this policy will be adopted by the Government as a basis of a policy of militia reorganization. Until some such solid foundation is laid the work of the military executive cannot produce any permanent effect, and it will continue to be seriously hampered.

Now, these are very serious words, and it is a very thorough change that the General suggests. He has given that scheme in detail to the department, and the department proposes to make a change by increasing the headquarters staff by \$2,500, and decreasing the district staff by \$7,000. I wish to know whether those increases in the headquarters staff and decrease in the district staff have made been made in pursuance of the plan suggested by the General? The hon. gentleman must know what changes the General proposed to make and the House is entitled to know them.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I may tell my hon. friend that the estimates were carefully gone over by the Major-General and the deputy head and myself, and that they met with the approval and are in pursuance of the Major-General's policy. The chief item is the abolition of the office of Brigade-Major.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The General says in his report that he has submitted the details of a scheme for the reorganization of the staff, and the hon. Minister informs us that his estimates are based on that scheme. We should like to know those details.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They have met with my approval and are before His Excellency in Council. I am basing my estimates upon them, and possibly may be able at a later date to submit them, but at present I cannot do so as I have not the assent of the Governor in Council.

Mr. LISTER. Before the hon. gentleman can ask us to vote this amount, it is his duty to state what the scheme is on which he asks for this sum. He cannot avoid doing so under the pretense that the matter is before the Council. The Council have evidently acted upon the recommendation, because the hon. gentleman tells us that this vote is based on it, and we have the undoubted right to insist on knowing what this recommendation is. It may be a proper one or it may not, but it does not follow that because it has been recommended by the Major-General this committee should vote money based on it. The hon. gentleman should either submit the details of the scheme or suspend the item until he can do so.