

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This was introduced originally by the late Government. We intended, at the time, allowing \$50, believing there was only 1,000 entitled to the pension, but it turned out that the air of Canada is so conducive to longevity that there were 3,000 instead of 1,000 as, according to actuary statistics, we thought there would be.

Mr. VAIL. How many have been put on the roll last year?

Mr. CARON. There have been few applications.

Mr. VAIL. It is high time this was stopped. The ex-Minister of Finance has stated we did not suppose that in the first instance there would be more than a thousand persons; for eight years it has been now going on, yet the amount is still \$18,000. A man to be entitled to this must be ninety-years of age, and it is hardly possible there are six or seven hundred people of that age out of the number engaged in the war of 1812.

Mr. CARON. That is precisely what I told the hon. gentleman last year, when he came then to have a few new names put on the list.

Mr. VAIL. But these men were applicants in 1877, and if they were entitled to it then, surely, if living, they would be entitled to it to-day.

Mr. CARON. That is why I do not want to make any promise. If the hon. gentleman considers these two men should be put on the roll, they will, should proper representation be made, be put on the list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. gentleman give back pay when a claim is entertained?

Mr. CARON. No back pay.

Mr. PATERSON. If a claim is valid it should apply to back years. Because a man did not attend to his claim, he should not lose the pension he would have got in previous years had he attended to it.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. Minister of Militia is quite right with regard to placing of new names on the roll. If the proposition of the hon. member for Digby were carried out, these gentlemen, no matter how much they might be entitled to it, would be ruled out by such a proceeding, and I hope the Minister will not adopt any such hard rule. There may possibly be some old gentlemen who have no friends to direct their attention to the fact that the Government are making these annual payments, and it would be unfair that they should continue to be deprived of them because they have not been in a position to take advantage of them. If the hon. member for Digby were correct, these gentlemen who were not fortunate enough to have anyone to present their claims, would be deprived. I think probably my hon. friend from East Elgin is presenting a case which is a deserving one, and I think the Minister should not be placed in a position to draw the rule so straight as to prevent his considering such a case.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt if any parties, who are entitled to pensions and have not hitherto applied for them, can show they are entitled to them, they should receive them; but the fact that eight years have gone by is ground for a strong suspicion that they are not entitled to them, and it will require all the more careful examination in the office to see that the application is genuine. Seventy years have gone by since the war of 1812-15 closed, and the parties must have been more than sixteen years of age at the time, so that they must be now nearly ninety years of age, and it is rather extraordinary that so large a number, looking at the Census return of our population, are still alive. We must take care that the same condition of things does not exist here as exists in the neighbouring Republic, where the

number of those who have been engaged in the military service increases from year to year instead of diminishing.

54. Compensation to pensioners in lieu of land... \$5,120 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this about military asylum pensions, put in on the opposite side of the page, for the first time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is statutory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the nature of it? I do not understand it exactly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that was for the Quebec hospital.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about the super-annuation allowances? \$10,000 additional are demanded under the Statute, or supposed to be. That has increased tremendously fast under the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is statutory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know, but we usually discuss it under the pensions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is merely an estimate. That is not a vote at all.

Mr. PAINT. I thought, when any hon. member addressed the Ministry, he usually stood up to do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; the hon. member is the sitting member.

#### MILITIA.

55. Salaries, military branch and district staff... \$19,800 00

56. Brigade Majors' salaries, transport expenses, &c. .... 17,500 00

Mr. BERGIN. I would ask the Minister whether it is his intention to increase the pay of the district staff? There is a very general feeling, not only amongst the members of the active militia, but through the country, that the district staff is not sufficiently paid, and I must say that I was very much struck by an article in the *Montreal Star*, which has been copied by most of the papers throughout the country, and copied approvingly, which points out the very curious fact that subaltern officers in the new militia schools established last year are receiving a salary almost, if not quite equal to that of the Deputy Adjutants General, and I find that the head of the Artillery School, the Inspector of Artillery, receives \$1,500, \$600 more than the others, with an allowance of \$500, the same as the Deputy Adjutants-General receive. Now, these officers are, many of them, men who have seen service, men who have been wounded in the service of the country; they are skilful men, able men, highly educated men, thoroughly competent for the positions they occupy, and it does seem somewhat anomalous that they should not receive a larger salary than that of subaltern officers, men who never wore the uniform of Her Majesty until they were appointed the other day. I am sure this has been an entire oversight on the part of the Minister, and I feel quite satisfied that he will be pleased that we have directed his attention to it, for I am quite sure, if he had noticed it, he would have placed the Deputy Adjutants-General upon a better footing. The salary that is given to them now is the salary that was given to them years ago, and surely, after such lengthened service, with the experience they have had, they ought to get a larger sum than they do now; and it ought not to be overlooked that these gentlemen were removed from their homes a couple of years ago, and put to a great additional expense, and some of them are put to great expense to keep their homes in good order, so that they may not go to destruction until their return, not being able to rent them to advantage. I hope the Minister will give his attention to this matter.

Mr. HALL. I am able to confirm what has been said in reference to these officers. The Brigade Major in the dis-