

glad to be aware of that fact and to state it to the committee. This is the first I have heard of this correspondence.

I sympathize very much with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington). I was medical officer myself for many years in my own province, and received whatever fees pertained to that official, while being also a member of parliament. During the recess between sessions I examined men for the schools and received pay for it, whether properly or improperly; I thought I had a right to do so under the Independence of Parliament Act. But I would say in support of the opinion of the leader of the opposition, that if, in order to remove all doubts, it is necessary to make some amendment in the Independence of Parliament Act, it should be done at once; and if my hon. friend will indicate the words that he thinks should be introduced, I will ask the Minister of Justice to take the matter up at once. I agree about the importance of having as many military men as possible in the House, and particularly men who have taken such a keen interest in military affairs and who have distinguished themselves so highly as the hon. member for Sherbrooke has done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think what the minister has said is very satisfactory. I have no criticism to make upon the action of the Deputy Minister of Militia, except in so far as his conduct appears in the correspondence to be, I thought, rather curt, and not actuated by a very friendly spirit towards my hon. friend from Sherbrooke, nor was it such a spirit as might be expected to be evinced toward a man who had had the distinguished public career and performed the public services which the member for Sherbrooke had performed. However, we will let that pass. I will be glad to send to the Minister of Militia the amendment which I think should be made in the law to cover this case.

I would like to say one or two words about the main subject we have been discussing this evening. I realize that the conditions are not quite the same as they were in 1896-7, because we have at the present time, or there is proposed to be now, a permanent force of 3,000, and the permanent force at that time I believe was about 800. Let me point out to the Minister of Militia that upon the statement which he has brought down to parliament, in 1896-7, there was an expenditure of \$2,413,651, while during the coming year he proposes to expend \$5,493,102.50. To that is to be added, I suppose, a certain sum in the supplementaries for next year, one amount that is mentioned being the sum of \$150,000 for annual drill. Therefore we will assume that the total estimate for the year will run up to nearly \$6,000,000. Well, we are to have a larger permanent force now, a permanent force more than three

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

times as large as we had in 1896-7. But when you come to look at the number of men who will be drilled this year as compared with 1896-7, the difference does not appear to be so great. According to the statement which the minister brought down there were drilled in 1897, 36,298 men, and there were also included in the force that year 3,471 horses. In the year 1905, according to the estimate which the minister has brought down, there will be drilled 43,983 of all ranks, including 7,640 horses. That is exclusive of the permanent force.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Where does the hon. gentleman get his figures?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On page 9 of the statement where it is said: 'The numbers called out for training this year exclusive of the permanent force, are as follows.' Then it gives the totals of men and horses that I have mentioned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend will look at the last page of the statement he will find the figures for 1896-7 as being 36,298 men, and on the same line he will find the number for 1904-5. But these are the establishments. We have not given the numbers called out for drill in 1896-7, we have only given the establishment, and opposite that is placed the number called out for drill in 1904-5.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that to be last year, meaning the fiscal year 1904-5.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is necessary to understand the militia term for 1896 in order to find out the exact number.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let us take then the comparison of the establishments. There is a difference of about 6,000 men. In 1896-7, there were 36,298, in 1904-5—I took that to be last year, and I thought that 43,000 referred to the present year, but that apparently is not so. The establishment is something different from the number of men called out. Well, let us take the 49,000; you have then an increase of a little over one-third in the establishment. But you have an expenditure of \$2,413,000 as compared with about \$6,000,000. Well, I concede at once that you must make a very important addition to the \$2,413,000 on account of the addition to the permanent force, and taking over the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is one other item to which I call my hon. friend's attention; in 1896-97 the item for arms, ammunition, &c., was \$745,965, whereas, in the present year, it is \$1,225,000 or nearly double.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Nearly \$500,000 more, I observed that. But, after all, you must rely in the end upon the men whom you call out and train and upon the men who, as the hon. minister says, will be avail-