

from what source the men obtained their outfit. If the men who had purchased theirs from the stores were entitled to compensation, those who obtained it, partly from the stores and partly through the assistance of their friends, were equally entitled to compensation. I hope the Minister will reconsider the matter.

Mr. EDGAR. I brought up this matter in this House some weeks ago, by a question to the Minister, in reference to what had been done in the case of the Toronto battalions, on the receipt by the Department of pay sheets which I had heard were signed by the men. Until just now, I thought that these sheets had been sent out by the Department; and I supposed it was extraordinary conduct on the part of the Department to issue the sheets and have them signed and then refuse to pay the men. It is not too late to rectify the wrong done. I believe the municipality of Toronto also made a formal claim on the Department to be paid this kit money, and the claim was not recognised. There is another argument in addition to that advanced by the hon. member for Muskoka in favor of these men getting their kit allowance. The Major of the battalion must have gone beyond his duty when he suggested to the Department that the battalion had no right to get the allowance.

Mr. TYRWHITT. As the Major of the battalion has been alluded to, I may say that I was one of the two majors of the battalion, but not the one by whom the communication was sent to the Department. I have argued from the first that the men were entitled to the allowance. I have not taken the active part in dealing with the Department that I possibly might have done had Col. O'Brien not been here to approach the Department. At the same time, I am possibly more interested than he, from the fact that the men claiming the allowance come principally from my neighborhood. Only last night I received a communication from one of the captains reminding me that I had guaranteed his allowance, and that owing to my having given this guarantee he had advanced it to his men, and he still holds me responsible for the amount. Only to-day I went to the Department with the view of seeing whether it was possible this grant might be made to us at an early day, as my memory has been jogged by being held responsible for what the captain had advanced to the men. I always considered we were entitled to the allowance, from the simple fact that it has been granted to other battalions, and because it is the ordinary rule to make these grants to men on active service in the field, and also from the fact that the men receiving fifty cents a day were making great pecuniary sacrifices, for which this paltry allowance did not remunerate them, except in a very small degree.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish to rectify one statement which has been made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). The hon. gentleman complained of this matter having been brought under the war commission instead of having been dealt with by the Department. The reason why it was brought before the war commission is that we have applications from a large number of municipalities who had in some instances given a good deal, and in other instances had given something less, and who claimed from the Department to be reimbursed. As I viewed it the only practicable way of dealing with it was to have these claims investigated, and a report made to me, so that I could look into the matter and ascertain what had been done. In the case of the Toronto battalion, as the hon. gentleman can easily find out, the amount of money paid out was paid directly for kit articles which were purchased for the men, and the municipality was not in any way considered. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating that a claim was made by the municipality, but, in the case of that municipality, as in the case of every other municipality, the application was refused. I must say, for my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, that he has been

time and again before the Department urging his claim, and certainly, if it has not been granted, it is not in any way due to a lack of insistence on the part of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) or my other hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Tyrwhitt).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may not quite correctly have apprehended the statements which have been made, but, if I did correctly understand them, the information which the Minister of Militia received appears to have been received, not from the Colonel in command, but from a subordinate officer. If that was the case, it appears to me that a breach of military etiquette, to say the least, was committed, and that the officer in command had some right to complain. The officer in command is the party with whom the Department ought to communicate in respect to claims of this kind, and, as I understand, he was not consulted; and an inferior officer—not the hon. gentleman who spoke before the Minister of Militia, but the other major—appears to have been consulted, and in consequence rather incorrect information seems to have been given to the Department as to the claims of the battalion, which have not been granted. If that be correct, I think the Department of Militia, or the person who is charged with communicating with the commandant of the battalion, certainly went out of his way, and rather threw a slur on that officer.

Mr. MULOCK. It is understood, I believe, that the Minister will bring down the reports?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, and I think it is much more satisfactory to deal with the matter when the reports come down, because it is inconvenient to make statements from memory. I may say, however, that the hon. gentleman will find that the Department of Militia did not go out of the ordinary way in getting the information which was required.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Care of Archives..... \$6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe, in connection with that, that last year there was an item which, in looking over the Auditor General's report, I do not quite understand. I see under the head of expenditure of London office the following entries: Copying archives, \$1,080; comparing, \$2,384. It appeared to me that these two items ought to have been reversed, that the copying of the archives ought to have engrossed a much larger portion of our vote than the comparing of any archives, but nearly two and a-half times as much is spent for comparing as is spent for the service of copying and adding useful papers, or interesting papers, at any rate to our library. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman or the officer in charge knows how such a thing came about.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman the information when we meet again at 8 o'clock.

Expenses in connection with *Patent Record*..... \$9,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire whether this printing of the *Patent Record* is part of the contract with Burland's Lithographic Company, or whether it is granted to them by the Department without tender. The chief work is done by Burland's Lithographic Company. I want to know whether that is under contract, or how that company comes to receive the work?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that it is part of the contract with the Burland Lithographic Company,