

suggests. Any regulation recommended by the central appeal judge and approved by the Governor in Council is made under the authority of this Parliament and may look to uniformity in the application of this Act. They have been able in Great Britain to formulate such regulations; there is no reason why they should not be able to do so here, having regard, of course, to the somewhat different conditions prevailing in Canada. I cannot answer the extreme assertions of the member for Edmonton that this clause provides for the exemption of everybody. A similar clause was in the British Act, but it did not provide for the exemption of everybody there. I know no reason to believe that we cannot have as intelligent tribunals in Canada as they have in England. But we cannot with too great particularity or solidity of rule define just what a tribunal must do in any individual case. Nor can we say in broad language to the tribunal: exempt a man if you think it is in the national interest, and send him to the front if you think that is in the national interest. One would be much too narrow; the other very much too broad; a line must be found between. The line is this: that we endeavour here to lay down principles that will guide the tribunal in determining what is in the national interest and what is not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is that principle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The principles are set out in (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of section 11. These are almost identically the principles that have been found sufficient in England. After many months' trial of the statute there, various amendments were suggested to Parliament and various improvements proposed in connection with different features of the Act, but they left those principles as they defined them initially, because they had found them satisfactory. It is not, I think, asking the committee too much to suggest that we have at least some regard to the experience of Great Britain in that matter. We will get the advantage of their decisions wherever they will be of use to us. I do not think, however, that we can afford on the one hand, to be more exacting, or, on the other hand, to be broader and more indefinite.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the Solicitor General will tell us who amongst the citizens of Canada cannot be exempted under subsection (a)?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the part of the Solicitor General to perform here the duty [Mr. Meighen.]

of tribunals. The duty of the Solicitor General is to explain the principle of the Act, not to say what the tribunals should do in any individual case. But if my hon. friend were himself a member of the tribunal, I should not have the least hesitation in bringing before him many men whom he and I commonly know and to whom he would have no difficulty in applying those principles.

Mr. OLIVER: It is not a question as to how far my friend and I might agree in regard to the application of these principles; it is a question of the responsibility of this Parliament of Canada for knowing how those principles are to be applied. I asked what I thought was a very reasonable and simple question, but my hon. friend was not able, or not willing, to give me an answer, and for the very good reason that only one answer was possible, and that was that under the section as it reads any tribunal may exempt any citizen of Canada from military service. There is no doubt about that. Will any member of this committee point out what citizen of Canada may not be exempted under this subsection from military service by a tribunal?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Assuming that a man were—

Mr. OLIVER: I have asked a plain question, and asking another question is not answering mine. I have asked a plain question, and if I cannot get an answer to it I shall have to be permitted to continue my remarks.

Mr. NICKLE: Take the case of a man engaged in a non-essential and non-productive industry.

Mr. OLIVER: Who is to say that the industry is non-essential and non-productive except the tribunal? And the tribunal can say whatever it pleases.

Mr. NICKLE: That is not the question my hon. friend asked. He asked any member of the committee to name any class of men who would not be exempt under this subsection. I say that under that subsection no man should be exempted who was engaged in a non-productive and non-essential industry, because it would not be in the national interests to exempt him.

Mr. OLIVER: The answer to that is that the tribunals are vested with the fullest possible discretion, and it is for them to say whether a given industry is a national necessity or not. If my hon. friend from Kings-