

with a family of seven would receive for his dependents the sum of \$139, while his portion would be \$19. I am informed that the recruiting officers are not very anxious to take recruits with families of ten or twelve.

Mr. MacNICOL: There is an article in to-day's *Citizen* referring to a man who had been enlisted in Ottawa with a family of twelve, eight of whom would benefit under the new bill. The result will be that his family will receive \$170 a month. I am not saying that is too much, but that is what he would receive.

Mr. POWER: I hardly think the patriotic fund would have to raise any money for the purpose of looking after that man's family.

Mr. SENN: In the case of a soldier's decease, have arrangements been made so that his family will fare as well as the family of a soldier who was killed in the last war?

Mr. POWER: By an order in council which was passed at the beginning of the week, I believe on September 1, the provisions of the Pension Act are to apply. As my hon. friend knows, the Pension Act applies to soldiers who took part in the last war, but its provisions have now been made to apply to those who are called for service during this war.

Mr. HOMUTH: For service or active service?

Mr. POWER: Both, if they are in the army now.

Mr. STIRLING: I am not quite clear as to the difference between service and active service. Am I right in supposing that those who enrolled under section 63 now come in under section 64, that section, which calls for active service, having been proclaimed?

Mr. POWER: In so far as the Pension Act is concerned, yes; in so far as this bill is concerned, I would have to inquire. I can tell my hon. friend that if it does not cover such a case, we will see that these men who are called out on service are treated in the same way as those called out on active service.

Mr. MANION: What I have to say really has nothing to do with the bill, but the subject has been mentioned by the minister. I should like to take this opportunity to step aside a little for a moment to mention one matter. The minister referred to private soldiers having families of six or seven. In my remarks the other day I suggested that soldiers with dependents should be kept out of the danger zones as far as possible. I just

draw this to the attention of the minister because he is one of the ablest ministers in the government.

Mr. POWER: Thank you.

Mr. MANION: I do not know that this is saying very much for him, but at any rate he is. However, I suggest to the government that they give serious consideration to seeing that men with large families are not sent into the danger zones. This should be done not only for the sake of the families but for the sake of the country because of the high allowances that would have to be paid; and if such a man becomes a casualty, there is a heavy pension bill to be paid by the country. No doubt the minister will have an opportunity to discuss this matter with his colleagues, and I think it should be seriously considered.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Property vested in corporation.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Are contributions to the patriotic fund to be wholly voluntary?

Mr. POWER: Yes.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: The bill is not clear on that point. I notice that clause 4 reads:

There shall vest in the corporation all moneys at any time collected by, or contributed to, the corporation.

The old act of 1914 had the word "contributed" only. But now it says, "collected by, or contributed to, the corporation". My own municipality was called upon to contribute the sum of \$28,000, and we had to issue debentures on which we paid interest and sinking fund up to the year 1937. I think it should be made quite clear that these contributions are to be voluntary only, and not a matter of conscription or confiscation. The municipalities at this time, after passing through the depression, are not in a condition to make any forced contribution to the Canadian patriotic fund.

Furthermore, in many parts of the country the Canadian patriotic fund has left a bad taste in the mouth, and I think the government would be well advised to change its title because, as the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) said a few moments ago in discussing the other bill, patriotism is sometimes the last refuge of a scoundrel. I know that in some parts of the country the Canadian patriotic fund has left a bad impression. It was abused by people who had money in the bank and had really no need for assistance from the fund. Other people, perhaps because they were too timid to go after assist-