

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said he did not wish it to be understood that he thought the salary was too high, because he did not think so, and moreover, he did not think there was any man in the public service that was more entitled to the confidence of the public than the present Deputy Adjutant General. All he asked was that when the Government came to appoint a successor, this system of allowances should be done away with, and a fixed salary paid.

Hon. Mr. VAIL—Hear, hear?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL was glad to find that the hon. Minister of Militia approved of his suggestion.

Hon. Mr. VAIL—I have no objection to promise the hon. gentleman that this matter will receive the fullest consideration on the part of the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE BOWELL observed that last year the Deputy Adjutant General received an amount in salary and allowances of over \$4,000, which was more than it was now proposed to pay the Major General. The public accounts showed that he received his salary, amounting to \$2,240; the usual allowance of \$600; and a bonus of \$534; and in addition to that, \$666 for extra services which he supposed was on account of having to fulfil the duties of the Adjutant General.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK was of opinion that the Government should state to the House whether they intended to act upon the suggestions contained in the very able and practical report of the Major General—that the staff appointments should be made for five years, and that the staff officers should be liable to be removed from one place to another—suggestions which he (Mr. KIRKPATRICK) approved of. He would also like to know whether the Government intended to have a Deputy Adjutant General at headquarters.

Hon. Mr. VAIL—No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said that he noticed in the estimates the sum of \$600 “contingencies, Deputy Adjutant General at headquarters.”

Hon. Mr. VAIL—That is for the Adjutant General's office. He proceeded to say that it was not usual for the Government to lay down their policy with reference to a report such as this, immediately on its being laid before the House. All he could say was that the

report would receive the fullest consideration, and the Government would adopt such portions of it as they thought were in the interests of the service and of the country.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL was of opinion that the Government should be prepared to declare their policy upon such questions, if they had any policy at all. Of course, if they wished more time to consider it, he was willing that they should have it. He wished to know from the Government whether it was their intention in any way to change the direct jurisdiction which the Minister of Militia had over militia affairs, and to give to the present commanding officer more powers than his predecessor enjoyed.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—The policy of the Government is not to tell my hon. friend what he asks at present, and when any change is made the House will receive the first notification of it.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—That is just about what I would expect from the arbitrary way in which the hon. gentleman conducts public business.

Hon. Mr. POPE, referring to the remarks of the member for Pontiac, stated that in his judgment the Government should at least place no obstacle in the way of their selecting Canadian officers if they found they were suited for the position. He, of course, did not object to the selection of Imperial officers, but he thought the Government should be free, when they found the opportunity, to make a selection from Canadians. He proceeded to say that the argument of the Minister of Militia that because the late Government had increased the expenses of the Militia Department, therefore the present Government were justified in increasing them also—was a very extraordinary one. As a matter of fact, the late Government were in a different position from the present Government on account of the threatened Fenian invasion, and they had, before they left office begun to reduce the Militia expenditure. The contended that the present Government, although they professed to have reduced the Militia expenditure, had actually increased it to the extent of over \$100,000.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he had no desire to interfere with the liberty of discussion, but he doubted the propriety