

pay of the volunteers is concerned, will be received with anything but satisfaction. I do not propose to offer an amendment; if the hon. Minister finds, notwithstanding the boasted surplus of the hon. Minister of Finance, that he cannot afford a simple act of justice to these men, I shall not offer any amendment. But year after year, when this matter comes up, it will be my duty, as a representative of the people, to call the attention of the Government to it; and I hope that in the course of a few years they will see their way to do this simple act of justice. You must remember that the ranks of the volunteers are increased by mechanics, clerks, bank clerks, and people occupying commercial positions throughout the country, and that while they are away, they are losing time and money, and they ought to be compensated to a reasonable extent; but 50 cts. a day I consider entirely inadequate to the services these men have to perform.

**Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).** The hon. Minister, the other night, I believe, questioned my right as a civilian to criticise his Militia Bill. Of course, I acknowledge the charge; I am a civilian, but I think I am within my right as a member of this House to criticise any measure which is proposed by the Government or by any member of the House. I think I am quite within my right as a civilian to criticise a Bill, when the hon. Minister of Militia considers it his right as a civilian to introduce a Bill. I agree very cordially with the Minister in the proposition he makes to pay the city corps for drill. In that respect, I think the Bill is a decided improvement on the old measure. I think that we have not, perhaps, paid sufficient attention to these clerks and others who have ample time on their hands, and who might be physically improved by joining the Militia, and who would be quite an acquisition to its ranks. I am not going to find fault with the hon. Minister's policy so far as it extends increased advantages to the force; I think that any steps he takes in that direction is a commendable one; but he proposes by this measure two or three changes which I think are entirely uncalled for. I see by the Estimates that he proposes to add an additional officer to the staff—an Inspector of Artillery at a salary of \$2,300. The duties of that officer were previously performed by the officers of "A" and "B" Batteries.

**Mr. CARON.** Will my hon. friend allow me to state that I am not creating a new office at all. The pay which this Inspector of Artillery has hitherto received out of the vote for "A" and "B" batteries is simply transferred from that vote and made a separate item. He has been transferred to headquarters, and we did not consider it right to have his salary charged against the vote for "A" and "B" batteries.

**Mr. ROSS.** I am satisfied with the explanation. Then there is an appropriation for a Quartermaster-General; and the hon. Minister has not explained to me satisfactorily what his duties are, and what necessity there is for such an officer at all. I am afraid that if we give him power to appoint an officer of this kind, who seems to me to be a supernumerary, the position will soon be filled, although the duties may not begin for several years. I hope the hon. Minister will dispense with that part of his resolution relating to this officer.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I must say, with reference to the increases proposed this year, that I for one entirely dissent from them. For several years past we have been increasing our Militia expenditure, and if the amount proposed under this Bill is added to the \$773,000 which is expended for Militia and Defence, it will bring the total expenditure up to a very large sum. There is an increase over last year of something over \$26,000. I think there is a great feeling in the country that we are spending a larger amount of this money for artificial show than for useful service. I think that when there are no appear-

ances of danger in the country we should keep these military expenditures as low as possible. I think that the Military College which was left us as a legacy by the last Government, like the Supreme Court, was saddled on the country, and we receive very little benefit from it. I do not think that because that was introduced under any previous Government, that is any strong argument why it should be continued to-day. It may be that in the towns and cities this expenditure is endorsed, but I believe we get very little return for it. If we make the very increase in the expenditure this year which this Bill calls for, the people will begin to believe there is extravagance in this line not commendable under present circumstances. I believe the most of this money is eaten up in the large cities and towns, and the volunteers in the country receive little or no remuneration at all. In all fairness the volunteers of the country, ought, if any increase is to be made, to receive this increase, and all this money should not be spent in the cities to keep what may be called an artificial show of a staff of men.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last has not read the Estimates, or he would not say what he has said. If he will look at the expenditure, he will find that the staff costs only \$30,000, out of the \$773,000, and if he considers that a large proportion, he cannot know much about the subject. With regard to the Quartermaster-General, I think it is right the Government should have power to make the appointment, in case of any trouble, and we must take the pledge of the hon. Minister, that he will not make the appointment unless it becomes absolutely necessary. I thoroughly agree with the proposition, that the officers of county corps should receive the same pay as those of the city corps, and also with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lambton, that an increase should be given to the term of service; and I hope the hon. Minister will take that into consideration. He might even say that all the men who enlist for a second term of three years should receive increased pay. That would not be much additional expense, and would be felt as a great advantage. I would also ask the hon. Minister if he would act on the suggestion I made the other day, to increase the pay of officers commanding field batteries over that of a regimental captain. An officer having charge of so much Government property and commanding 70 or 80 men should at least have the pay of the major of an infantry battalion. All this outcry against the expense of the Militia sounds childish when we consider the small amount we expend on the service. Why, the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada expended a large amount. Here the expenditure now is less than 25 cents per head of the population; in the United States the standing army costs \$1 per head and the Federal States spend more on their State militia, than we; the expenditure of the British Government on its army amounts to \$4 per head of its population. With our surplus of \$7,000,000 and a revenue of \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000, to say we should expend less is to say we are to be different from any other civilized country on the face of the earth.

**Mr. VAIL.** Do I understand correctly that \$8,000 to \$10,000 would be the additional expense?

**Mr. CARON.** Yes.

**Mr. VAIL.** Really I do not know that there is any objection to it if the country can afford it. But I remember, when hon. gentlemen opposite sat on this side of the House they never lost an opportunity of finding fault with us on account of our expensive staff, and they said that any increased expenditure should be in the direction of payment to the men. Now, it so happens this is entirely on the staff and the men are to be neglected altogether. I think the amount the officers receive is entirely out of proportion with that of the men. I think the least the Government should