

try. Then, while the clause, as it would read after the proposed amendment, would not, of itself, positively exempt any one, the trouble is it might be considered as exempting them, and might cause a great deal of dissatisfaction, when certain people found they were not exempted. Some people engaged in agriculture in some parts might be dispensed with. In the part of the country in which the Solicitor General and I live, I presume there are not very many who could be dispensed with, because the farms are large, and the country is so thoroughly drained of suitable farm help, that the danger is that we will not have enough men to attend to our harvest and threshing. But I think that is not the case throughout the whole of Canada. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Perth (Mr. Morphy) would work a very serious hardship in the western country. I think my hon. friend will find that the people in the West move around a great deal more than they do in the East. We find hundreds of men engaged bona fide in farming, just as faithfully as any man in the country is engaged in that occupation, but they have only started this season. They have bought farms, and expect to raise thousands of bushels of grain. A man may be working alone, as many of them are. He may have thousands of bushels of grain growing now, but if my hon. friend's suggestion were adopted, he would not be exempt at all; he could not possibly be exempt, and the grain would have to go to waste, because if we take men from the farms in the western country, as my hon. friend will understand very well, and compel them to go to the front, the crop will be almost sure to go to waste. There are no surplus men to be had there. Every farmer there is required to look after the farms. There may be odd men, such as the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) suggests, who are trying to hold the farmers up. I have no objection to seeing those fellows being sent away, even if they are farm labourers. I think it would be safe for us to leave the clause as it stands. I desire to make a suggestion, but I am not sure how pertinent it is. We have referred occasionally to regulations made under the Militia Act, and to rules of court, made by judges of the supreme court of the different provinces. It seems to me that there is considerable difference in the application of those regulations. The rules of court cover technical questions, which can be better dealt with by the judges of the supreme court than

[Mr. Thomson.]

any one else, and the regulations under the Militia Act cover technical questions, which can be better dealt with by the Government, advised by their military officers. But I believe that this House is in a better position to deal with these exemptions than any one else, and I suggest to the Government that they should consider the advisability of making such regulations as apply to the exemptions a part of the Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): make it a matter of statute.

Mr. THOMSON: Whether we adopt that suggestion or not, I should like to have the regulations, at least under this particular section, disposed of by this House. Make them part of the statute, if you like.

Mr. RAINVILLE: I agree with some of the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). With regard to these exemption sections, we would like to know how the provision is going to work. The first exception, (a), refers to the man who is habitually engaged in a certain kind of work. The second exemption (b), refers to the man who has special qualifications, and the third exemption (c), deals with the man who is being educated or trained. The fourth (d), provides for the case of a man who has exceptional financial or business obligations. The fifth exemption (e), refers to health or infirmity, and the sixth exemption (f), deals with conscientious objections. The judge will be called upon to decide on these very cases, and the duty of the judge will be to find the 100,000 men who are to be sent to the front. When that point is reached, is that all? I say: No, it is not all. Some people are demanding the conscription of wealth; I would claim conscription for the promotion of agriculture and industry. Then another question is: who is going to direct the rejections or exemptions? Who is going to say that a man who is keeping a cigar store, for instance, would be more useful if he were placed on the farm? Then we have the case of the man on the farm who is doing nothing in the way of producing. Who is going to direct that he shall be exempted? Will it be the judge? It is impossible to think that a judge can deal with that. We will have to get some kind of machinery in the administration to deal with those exemptions, and get together the full strength of the nation, and direct it in the best interests of Canada and of the Em-