

(c) That by reason of his occupation his calling-up for military service is contrary to the public interest.

(d) That by reason of his domestic circumstances or for any other reason his calling-up for military service would be a cause of undue hardship to himself or others.

Apart from the other two sections, those are the only two exemptions. One is in the public interest and the other covers the private interest. The sections are much less specific than the sections of the present Bill. The British Bill, which has been referred to by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), is about in the same terms as the measure before us. It is practically framed upon the ground of national interest. My hon. friend will observe the words "national interest" are used in the first three subsections. You can practically put all these in one provision, and say that if in the national interest a man should not go, the tribunal should exempt him. The other class relates to private interests. In the United States Act, dealing with the class in question, the exemptions are:

Persons engaged in industries including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the military establishment, or the effective operation of the military forces, or the maintenance of national interest during the emergency.

It all comes back again to the question of national interest. So that either we must go into such details that the Bill would be unworkable or unjust, or lay down such general principles as have been placed in the Bill for the guidance of the judge, and leave him to make the selection. It seems to me we cannot make any other provisions. We cannot go to one extreme or the other. For my part, I would prefer to adopt what has been done in Great Britain, the United States and New Zealand.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to push this matter, but if the Government is intent upon following its policy, it has supporters behind it to enable it to carry out that policy; but I want to say that, in my humble judgment, there is no parity between the conditions in New Zealand and this country, or between those of the United States and this country. We have nothing on record to show that the Government of New Zealand, prior to the adoption of compulsory military service, was absolutely in league with certain industries of the country to prevent voluntary enlistment. That is the condition we have in Canada, and that is a condition that I, for one, consider most serious, when we are looking at this

matter as we have to look at it. We must recognize that while in one breath we are told that this Bill is for the purpose of finding men who will maintain our honour and the strength of the Empire in the bloody trenches of Flanders, in the next breath we are told that the purpose of the Bill is to maintain the industries of Canada. I wanted the provision to be one way or the other. If we have to maintain the strength of our contingent in France, let us frame a Bill that will do that honestly and fairly, but let us not, under the pretence of supporting our men who are at the front to-day put through a Bill, the real purpose of which will be to protect the interest, the advantage, the pockets, of the munition profiteers, in Hamilton or Toronto, or in Sydney, the men who, it is admitted, successfully used pressure on this Government to secure the letting up of voluntary enlistment in their neighbourhood.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): It seems to me that the hon. gentleman from Edmonton, in the argument he advances, totally overlooks the fact that to organize a democracy such as Canada for the successful prosecution of the war, you must vest in some impartial tribunal or tribunals somewhere the right of deciding who shall go and who shall stay. I am quite ready to admit that long ago I got beyond the position of regarding what this province had done, or what that province had done, in reference to this war. It has been admitted that some of the provinces have done more than others. I think the hon. gentleman from Edmonton is right in saying that the province of Alberta has done singularly well. Other provinces perhaps have not borne their fair share of the sacrifice. But, surely, after almost three years of war, we have reached the decision that we as Canadians, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, can regard the fact that Canada is at war and that the situation is serious.

The member for Edmonton says that this Bill is not fair as between man and man. I listened with great care to what he said in this committee and tried to gather what he meant when he said that the Bill was not fair as between man and man. If I correctly interpreted his words, he means this: No tribunal will be able to arrange any scheme of administration that will make equality of sacrifice. I quite agree with my hon. friend in that; it is absolutely impossible, in a war like this, to secure equality of sacrifice. But is that any reason