

or to do that. You have to have some arrangement under which men would be willing to go on the farms. Some provision should be made for the distribution among the different industries of Canada—a provision which I do not find in this Bill—of the men who cannot go to the front. Many men who are physically unfit for military service are fit for some other form of service. We are taking no steps to place these men in a position to relieve men who are fit to go to the front, or to provide for a distribution of the man-power that is not called upon for military service. Such distribution should take place among various industries of Canada, which will be very much crippled if that course be not adopted. The member for St. John suggested that the men who cannot go to the front should be asked to serve in some other capacity at the same wage as that paid to the soldiers. Theoretically, that sounds all right, but I fear that it would not work out in practice. In order to ensure the success of this measure and of the Bill that I suggest should be passed concurrently with it, steps should first be taken to secure the co-operation and sympathy of organized labour. I fear that the step suggested by the member for St. John would make that an impossibility. I suppose that if his suggestion were adopted, we would have to have a Patriotic Fund, separation allowance, pension fund, or something equivalent to all these, for the men who did not go to the front and who engaged in other work at the same wage as that paid to the soldiers. Then, to place a man in an industrial establishment at, say, \$2.50 a day when a man beside him would be earning \$4 or \$5, would so disarrange labour that the plan could not be successfully worked out. I am afraid that the carrying out of this proposal would not secure to the Government or to Parliament that co-operation of labour organization without which none of these Bill will be very successful. It is reasonable, though, to say that every man who does not go to the front ought to be asked to do something else for which he is fitted. I again say that the Government ought to place before the House with all possible speed proposals for the co-ordination and utilization of all forces not dealt with by this Bill, because this Bill cannot be as intelligently discussed by itself as it could be if we had a measure of the kind that I have suggested to discuss with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I realized when I moved the amendment that certain difficulties

would attend the proper working out of the proposal. But it is not impossible to devise an amendment to this Bill which would tend to equalize the wages paid to those who engage in some other branch of the national service and the wages paid to those who enter upon active service and go to the front. I quite agree with the member for North Oxford that it would not do to fix the wages of those who engage in some branch of the national service other than military service at what is now paid to the soldiers. The reason is that this country has treated its soldiers in a most shameful manner. Canada is not paying her soldiers that to which they are fairly entitled; everybody admits that. Some gentlemen answer by saying that the soldier does not go to the front with the idea of getting adequate wages. Pushing that argument to the extreme limit, you would say that the soldiers should not be paid anything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What sum would the hon. gentleman suggest that we pay the soldier and the mechanic?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would say that a fair wage to those engaged in the national service either in the way of serving at the front or in the way of performing labour would be \$2 or \$3 a day. Probably \$3 would be fair under the present circumstances. A soldier at the front is probably not so much concerned about the money that he himself gets as he is about the provision of adequate living expenses to his wife and family, his mother, or the sisters whom he has left at home. Naturally the fact that his family would not be fairly well provided for would have a deterring effect upon a man in respect to his going to the front. I do not see why a man who is called upon under this clause to enlist and who says: My services would be better devoted to some other work in the national interest, should not, if he is exempted from going to the front, serve the nation for the compensation that he would get if he went to the front. He runs no risk of life or limb; he enjoys all the comforts of home. Being under obligation by law to serve his country, why should he not be willing, if exemption be granted to him, to do so for the same compensation as that which is granted to the soldier? If that were done and the nation were to take charge of the manufacture of munitions and other supplies necessary for the soldiers, the wages could be very easily equalized and justice would be done all round. Many of our