

subordinates, they had only during the sittings of this Commission become aware of some existing difficulties. One officer mentioned in his evidence, "I was unaware that so many instances of delay had occurred until I received newspaper reports of the evidence given before your Commission in districts, and remedying instructions were at once issued."

#### *Training of Administrative Officers.*

We found in the districts many cases of friction and resentment on the part of outlying units at the difficulty in obtaining supplies. It was ascribed to the multiplicity, or ignorance, of the regulations. But when we arrived at Headquarters we found that the regulations were often quite good, only the men in the districts had received no training in their special, and oftentimes technical, work; hence the vexation that was evident.

We were surprised to find that the officers in charge of the Administrative Branches at Headquarters were not consulted, and had no say, in the appointment of their subordinates in districts. Not only was their advice not sought, but when given regarding an appointment it was usually ignored. It was curious to find that the Adjutant-General or the Chief of the General Staff had to do with appointments to administrative branches outside their control, and with the duties of which they could not be thoroughly familiar. It is therefore clear to us that all administrative officers (and with other branches this report is not concerned) should be carefully trained before being sent out to districts or hospitals and convalescent homes.

#### *Suggestions from Subordinates, &c.*

One is forced to the opinion that the military-trained man is slow to accept suggestions from junior officers, and, if compelled to accept them, he is economical of praise. Sometimes a portion is taken out of a suggestion lest the junior might think he had shown more initiative than his senior. There seems too little elasticity in military methods; and, if there are two systems in question, one or the other will be adopted, but it rarely occurs to the military man to adopt a third method by choosing the best out of each of the other two.

It would appear that a man—in a district, for instance—may be regarded as a nuisance because some of his suggestions are not practicable; and a recommendation emanating from him may be turned down, not because it is bad, but because it happens to come from that person. It would be well if a more judicial frame of mind could be assumed, so that suggestions coming along would be treated on their merits, and not as "piffle" (quotation) because originating from a person lightly regarded or of humbler rank.

#### *Copying English Army Methods.*

We have been too prone in the dominions to copy English Army methods because they are English Army methods; but experience in this and other wars has proved that to be a very excellent reason for *not* copying some of them. In the English Army labour has been cheap and plentiful, and on some administrative jobs there, notably Army Service Corps work, and in a lesser degree Ordnance and Stores services, a very large staff is necessary to carry out a too elaborate system. In newer countries methods are more direct, and a system should be evolved to suit our local conditions. Large staffs, such as they had in England, would not be tolerated here; nor are they necessary, as this war has shown. Some officers on loan here from the English Army, especially if they have been here during the whole period of this war, do not realize the vast changes that have taken and are still taking place in English Army methods. "The old order changeth, yielding place to new," and the end is not yet.

As an excuse for tortuous procedure we often had King's Regulations hurled at us; but as a "certain mischievous person" is said to quote Scripture when it suits him, so King's Regulations, large in number and wide in variety, come in handy to the ingenious.