

empt either totally or partially the following:

County and municipal officials, custom house clerks, persons employed in the United States in the transmission of the mail, artificers and workmen employed in the armouries, arsenals and navy yards of the United States, and such other persons employed in the service of the United States as the President may designate. Also pilots; mariners actually employed in sea service of any citizen or merchant within the United States; 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; those in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable; and those found to be physically or morally deficient.

Then there is a provision, as in our Act, for the establishment of local boards, one for each county, and one for each 30,000 of a city population. They are appointed by the President to hear and determine all questions of exemption. Except that they have no jurisdiction—I do not exactly know the reason for this—over the class of persons described as “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 the national interests during the emergency.” It may be that there is something in the argument of my hon. friend from Edmonton. It may be that the United States have taken the position that local boards should not have the wide powers of discrimination in the class I have just mentioned, for “maintenance of national interests during the emergency” is a very wide term indeed.

The United States Act also provides for a district board which hears appeals from the local boards, and which has original exclusive jurisdiction in determining what persons shall come within the class I have just read. Appeals are provided for the same as in our Act.

So for all practical purposes, with the exception that the United States Act specifically mentions some classes who are exempt, their Act is the same as ours, except that it requires each state to supply its quota according to population. Our Act is a very simple one, requiring very little study to see what it means. Clause 2 is the operating section, and describes the classes that shall be subject to military duty. The balance of the Act is practically devoted to the selection of the men and the

necessary machinery therefor. Under this Act there is an intelligent selection of the persons called for military duty having regard to conditions in Canada to-day, whereas under the old Act the selection by ballot was a most haphazard affair. The operating section reads:

Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section 3 of this Act . . . shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada.

That is the exact wording of the old Act, and Sir Charles Fitzpatrick construed it as giving the Governor in Council and Parliament power to say that the men so called out could be sent to India or any other place.

I wish to say a word or two with reference to some remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday. He made what seemed to me a most remarkable statement when he said that the conscription of wealth should be a condition precedent to the conscription of man-power. Apparently, he is firmly convinced that the first and essential consideration at the present time is the conscription of wealth; he thinks that is more necessary than the conscription of men. So far as I know there has been no appeal for wealth to be used in this war that has not been met; that is, we are not suffering by reason of the lack of wealth in our conduct of the war. Up to the present time the needs of the Government have been met by means of taxation and other means which have proved sufficient for the effectual carrying on of the war. In view of that, there is no need to seek vengeance on somebody who has not a son to send to the front, by extracting from his pocket something that is not yet actually needed at the present time, and throwing it up against a corner of the fence; that will not help to win the war. Arms, ammunition and wealth are necessary for the winning of the war, but of what avail are they without man-power? Major W. P. Purney, the president of the Great War Veterans Association, has expressed some views on this question. He thinks there should be some conscription of wealth, but he believes that the conscription of men should come before the conscription of wealth. He goes further and says:

If the conscription of wealth is in any way going to interfere with the conscription of men I would brush it aside.