

Higher wages are being paid in every other department of the government, and we found it absolutely necessary to increase them here. We increased last year the pay something like 25 cents per day for each man, and I hope we will be able to get along this year without further increase.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister considered the propriety of giving the first contingent the same pay as was received by the second? That was brought to the attention of parliament last session, and he said he would consider the matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Before the supplementaries come down I may be able to give an answer. The matter was discussed last session and I thought it seemed to be the sense of the House that the law, as it stood, should not be disturbed. However, I will bring the matter up again in council, and have it discussed and give an answer later.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the feeling is very general, in view of the splendid services rendered by the men of the first contingent, that it was an invidious distinction to pay them a much smaller per diem allowance than the men who succeeded them. I am satisfied that if the minister should ask parliament to vote the amount necessary to increase the pay of the men, it would be cheerfully done. The pay did not influence the men of the first contingent, or those of the second contingent either, and I think that the men of the first contingent are entitled to as much per diem as the men who followed them.

Militia—chargeable to income—military properties, \$190,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Some time ago, discussing the Sussex armoury, I made a statement which I wish to correct. I found some fault with the architect who designed the armoury and who had apportioned the different parts of it to the several corps. I think that I stated at that time that the compartments that were to be given to each company of the infantry were made the same size as those set apart for each squadron of cavalry. I was speaking from recollection of what had been said to me. I find that, technically, I was wrong. But, practically I was right. The armoury is divided into two equal portions, one half being devoted to the 8th regiment of cavalry, and the other to the 74th battalion. Now, the 74th battalion consists of six companies, with the total strength of 278. The cavalry has a total strength of 359, or nearly a hundred more than the infantry. In the case of the cavalry, there is the horse equipment, and the equipment of a horse will occupy fully as much space as the equipment of a man. The compartments were not as I stated they were, of equal size, for there are six compartments in one half, one for the use of the quartermaster

and the others for the use of the companies; in the other case there are five compartments, one for the use of the quartermaster, and four for the accoutrements of men and horses. Generally speaking, the point I made was that the same amount of room was devoted to the 74th battalion as was devoted to the 8th cavalry, though the cavalry consisted of something like eighty more men than the infantry and also had the equipment of the horses to consider. Therefore, my contention was a proper one, and there is actually not room enough for this regiment of cavalry and its equipment. I think that at that time the minister said that the Oliver equipment when issued to the men, would take up a good deal more room. But, even so, I must persist in my claim that the division is not properly made, if it is made along the lines suggested.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) made the statement, I felt that it was an important one, because it seemed to reflect upon the work of the architect. The question is not so much as to how the space is divided, for it is possible the 74th regiment might be increased in strength, or, if there was extra room another infantry corps might be accommodated, for this room is not necessarily limited to the 74th. But the real question is the one to which the hon. gentleman referred at the end of his remarks—is there sufficient accommodation for the cavalry? The hon. gentleman says there is not. But my officers say that there is.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say that my authority is the quartermaster of the 8th Hussars, who ought to know.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) speak to the colonel about it?

Mr. FOWLER. I did not happen to see the colonel, but the quartermaster would know more about it than the colonel.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understand that the plan was submitted to the colonel before the work was gone on with, and he approved of it. The chief engineer of the department says that the plan was prepared by him, giving the accommodation asked for by the General Officer commanding.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that the chief engineer of the Militia Department has made a recommendation, as follows:

The present system by which the Public Works Department construct all military buildings is very unsatisfactory, and considerable trouble and delay is occasioned thereby. I would strongly urge the necessity of having the construction, as well as the maintenance and repairs of these buildings under the charge of the engineer branch of the Department of Militia and Defence.