

able in addition to them so as to make up what he calls, I think, his first line of defence, 100,000 men. Is there not a very much greater advance in the cost to the country of the militia service at the present time than there is in the number of men annually trained now as compared with what was accomplished in 1896? Then, there is another circumstance that struck me very forcibly as to which I would like to have some explanation. As I understand it the theory of the Department of Militia is this: You are to train a certain number of men, between 40,000 and 50,000 every year and you expect, in the event of necessity, to call out 45,000 or 55,000 more men who will be to a certain extent untrained, who certainly will not have the training that is to be found among the men who go into these camps every year and who in that way increase their daily allowance from 50 cents to 75 cents.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All the active militia will get \$1 a day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I mean \$1. But the idea of making that increase is that you will get men to attend the camps year after year and therefore, if there is any advantage at all in that increase of pay, it will be found in this, that these men year after year, up to a certain number, will attend the camps and in that way they will require a better training than hitherto. I observe on pages 8 and 9 that there is a considerable difference between the training establishment of each battalion called out for training in 1905 and each battalion called out for training in 1904. That is what is intended, is it not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the difference is in the number of officers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that and that is what I want to call attention to. In 1904 the standard was 420 men and in 1905, 353. The memorandum goes on to state:

The principal difference between the two is that in the training establishment of this year the number of captains is reduced from 16 to 8; the number of lieutenants is reduced from 24 to 16; the number of sergeants is reduced from 48 to 32; and the number of corporals is reduced from 48 to 24 in each rural regiment of infantry.

What I am asking is entirely for information because I do not profess to have very much knowledge in regard to the matter and I only state my view as one who would like to be considered a man of common sense, if I may include myself in that class, but who does not know very much about the subject. You have 40,000 or 50,000 men whom you are training and you expect to make up your establishment by adding 50,000 men who have practically no training. But, while you are training these men you are reducing the number of officers. It would strike me that this is the last item you should reduce

because you should keep or increase the number of officers so that you will have a sufficient number of additional trained officers for the additional number of men who would be called out in time of trouble.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are officers enough in the companies, as stated in that memorandum, for 100,000 men.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is the case it meets my difficulty, but I did not understand you had so large a proportion before.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That was arranged under the Dundonald establishment and very properly, I think, with the view of having a very large number of officers in the second line, the expectation being that the central camp would be established and that these officers would be given opportunities of training there. The camp has not yet been established and they have been left out for the time being.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, that is quite satisfactory. Naturally, as that was not explained in the memorandum, I took it for granted that what formerly had been regarded as only a sufficient number was now being reduced. The hon. minister says the reason that the number of officers is not only sufficient for the number of men who are being trained annually but is also sufficient for the additional men necessary to make up the full quota of 100,000. This being so, my criticism and objection are fully answered.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question in regard to the treatment of men injured in camp. I know a young man who is now in the Toronto General Hospital and who was injured in the camp at Niagara. He will be laid up for quite a length of time. What provision is made for such cases? I understand that the department generally pays the expenses but what is done further I do not know.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is the pay of rank and subsistence allowance in cases of sickness arising in camp limited to sixty days and if a case goes beyond that it has to receive special treatment. Sometimes we come to parliament and ask for a vote and sometimes the cases can be dealt with by Order in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. As the injury in this case will certainly be of a permanent character, I would like to know if there is provision made in the form of a pension or anything of that kind.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a pension for active service, but it does not apply to camp. Of course, men going into camp have to take a certain amount of risk, but where a special case of hardship arises the minister will come to parliament and ask parliament to deal with it.