

voluntarily. He may have occupied a position in society from which he may have drawn a revenue of \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year. Suddenly he is told that all this counts for nothing. He is told: Your service to the State is measured by your ability to be a soldier and the work to which you have hitherto given your attention must be laid aside, the income which has been adequate for the maintenance of your family must be foregone and you must go overseas. At once this situation confronts the dependent mother or sister. Five minutes before this man became a soldier he had an income of say \$1,500 a year. Five minutes after he becomes a soldier, his income is \$1.10 a day plus such an amount as the Patriotic Fund cares to give. The allowances from the Patriotic Fund are given on well-defined lines: The amount to be given is settled according to the number in the family. Therefore, the amount cannot be increased unless the Patriotic Fund regulations are varied. Three cases in my own riding have recently come to my attention. One was the case of a sister who, before her brother went overseas, had a reasonable living allowance of \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year. Suddenly she finds her income reduced to the income that a private's wife would have, with the exception that there is no separation allowance. In other words, her brother may make a grant to her of not exceeding \$20 a month to maintain a home that has hitherto been kept in the style of about \$1,000 a year. Another is the case of a man connected with a large educational institution who had two brothers. One went to the front and I think was killed. The second I think went voluntarily. The third is in this educational institution. He is an unmarried man earning only a small salary, and although the mother has made application for separation allowance, a ruling has been given that as the boy who has been taken, is not the sole support of the mother and as there might be a possibility if the man in the educational institution directed his energies along another line, he might earn more—he is going to the university and following his studies while at the same time he earns money as an instructor—no separation allowance can be made. The third case is that of a widow. One son is going—and this is the case of a man going voluntarily—as a surgeon, and he is earning a good income. The other brother, a young man, is only starting as a medical practitioner. He wrote me a short time ago he was not able

to earn enough to support himself, much less to assist in the maintenance of his mother, and it has been ruled that, because the boy who remains at home may be of assistance to the mother, no separation allowance should be granted. As a representative of a constituency that has sent many men to the front, and that under the Military Service Act will send many more, I desire to advocate the rights as I see them of those who remain behind when the State demands the services of those on whom they have been dependent. I do not intend to branch out into a discussion in regard to the conscription of wealth, but when the State enlists the service of a man compulsorily it is the duty of the State to supplement, at least to the extent of the separation allowance, according to the rank the man holds, the income of those whose income has been depleted by the State saying to the man: "Your services are now required; no matter whether you wish it or not, you must go." I believe the general feeling throughout this country is that the dependents of those who have been, or are to be, conscripted are entitled to the most generous consideration of this House and of the country. This is not a question of an Act; it is a question of a regulation. It was a regulation passed by the Militia Department last year, and it established the principle that no separation allowance shall be granted when the boy taken is not the sole support. If I may read between the lines of the remarks made by the minister, I think he would be willing, if the consensus of opinion of this House was in that direction, that the regulation should have the careful consideration of his officers, and I trust his sympathetic consideration as well.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the minister taken into consideration, or does he understand the regulations in force in the United States in regard to the support given to the relatives of those who have gone to the front?

Major-General MEWBURN: In the United States the authorities go into the question of insuring the man.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And they also provide him with a revenue equal to what he had before going to the war.

Mr. T. M. TWEEDIE: This question of separation allowance is one in which every person is interested. I concur very heartily in the expression of opinion which has been given in regard to this particular class of cases which is the subject matter of the re-