I have not had the down to the House. pleasure of seeing this Bill yet, but I am glad to know that at last the hon. gentleman, and his colleagues also, I presume, have seen the necessity of providing for a pension. I sincerely trust that when it comes down we shall find that the hon. gentleman has not been niggardly in his provisions for making an adequate pension for the officers and men of the permanent corps.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, all the nations of Europe and the United States give pensions to their soldiers. In the United States they do not, as we do, give a superannuation allowance to their civil servants, but they do give pensions to their soldiers and very large pensions indeed to those who have served in their wars that have taken place during the last forty or fifty years. We also find that the North-west Mounted Police are at the present time placed in a different category from the permanent corps, in that they are allowed to pay into a superannuation fund like the civil service, and to get pensions when they leave the service. I have here a cutting from a newspaper giving an account of the reorganization of the British army as set forth by Mr. Broderick in the Imperial House of Commons, some little time ago. It shows how differently they look at the usefulness of the yeomanry and volunteers in Great Britain to what we do. That hon. gentleman said :

With regard to the yeomanry, we believe that it is absolutely necessary to obtain more mounted troops, and Lord Roberts has come to the conclusion that we ought to very largely increase this force under the title of the Imperial Yeomanry. Their uniform will be khaki; the sword will be given up, and they will be armed with a short rifle and bayonet. The payment of yeomanry while in camp would be 5s. a day, with rations and forage.

That is \$1.20 a day for yeomanry when in camp; whereas our men get only 50 cents a day.

The officers will receive cavalry and army rates, and each yeoman who brings his own horse will receive an allowance of the a year. As to volunteers, we require not so much an increase of numbers as increased efficiency. When in camp we propose to give them 5s. per day, and officers 11s. 6d.-

That is \$1.20 cents per day for privates, and nearly \$3 a day for the officers.

-but we intend to make the conditions stricter, and every man would be required to have put in an increased number of drills and musketry such a training as would make them a very valuable defensive force in the future.

Showing, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the British government look on the yeomanry, the volunteers and militia as of the greatest value to the defence of the country; and I think that hon. gentlemen in this House must now look on the militia of Canada in

moment for her militia. I think hon. gentlemen would peruse with great delight a paper that was read by Col. Geo. T. Denison at a meeting of the Imperial League, and I am going to base some remarks on some extracts from his speech. Col. Denison says that Canada must soon undertake some of the burdens which necessarily accompany national greatness and prosperity. Well, I do not think anybody will find fault with that. We are growing rapidly, we are coming to the front; we are, as the right hon. leader of the government said, now a nation; and such being the case, we must shoulder the responsibility of national existence. Col. Denison also draws attention to the fact that never in the history of the world have such tremendous armaments and preparations for defence been seen as we see now all over Europe and throughout the world generally. He also draws attention to the fact that no country is so unprepared as the colonies of the empire. The amount that the people of the British Isles are taxed per head for the army and navy is \$5.40. In the United States the people are taxed \$5.50 per head for the army and navy, and that is the federal tax alone. But in Canada, instead of being taxed \$5.40 per head, as they are in Great Britain, or \$5.50 per head, as they are in the United States, we only have to pay the insignificant sum of 40 cents per head. We know that we can look to Great Britain to defend us with her navy, a navy that costs an enormous sum of money, to which we do not contribute, so far as I know, one cent per annum. If we, in Canada, were to pay in the same proportion as Great Britain does for the defence of our country, according to population, we should be taxed to the extent of \$29,700,000 per annum, instead of what we are now paying for militia, which, in 1899, was \$2,212,000. If through any unfortunate circumstances we were included in the United States and had to pay taxes as they do, we would have to pay, according to our population, \$30,000,000 instead of a little over \$2,000,000. I draw this to the attention of the House to show how very little indeed the people of Canada are called upon to pay for the defence of their country. It cannot be expected that we can be a free people, as we are proud to call ourselves, unless we are willing to make the same sacrifices, or very nearly the same sacrifices, as the people in other civilized countries are making. I do not wish to be an alarmist; far be it from me to say that there is any danger looming ahead of us, but it is time that we awoke, it is time that the people gave a hint to the government that they should expend a sufficient amount of money to put Canada in a proper state of defence, to see that she is well provided with arms, ammunition and everything necessary to put the permanent corps and the militia of Canada in a fit state to take the field at any much Canada is paying at the present moment, and to make expenditure in com-parison with the population we have