

French soldier gets a matter of a few cents a day. I think there has been more talk in this House this afternoon about the pay of the soldiers than there has been by all the soldiers over in France. There has been more kicking here about their pay than there has been by all the soldiers overseas. We all realize we cannot value the services of our soldiers in dollars and cents. How then are you going to set a figure on their pay unless you try to deal fairly with them and compare this country with other countries?

Everybody is disposed to do the best he can for our soldiers at the front. There is no difference of opinion in regard to that on the part of the members of this House or in the country. It is all right now to get up and say that the soldier does not get enough pay. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) suggests \$3 a day for a private. I doubt very much if he will find many members to agree with him. Another says \$1.50 would be about right; somebody else would get up and say \$1.55, I suppose, and somebody else \$1.60. The question of pay is not what has kept men from enlisting. The reason why men have not enlisted in greater numbers is that they have been encouraged to remain at home and they feel that they are justified in remaining at home. Look at the Militia Gazette and you will find that in the fall of 1914 a great many young men were gazetted as lieutenants. They got the title of lieutenant and they are still remaining in Canada. They find it more profitable to run automobile garages than to go overseas. I do not know why they took out their commissions. Others find it advisable to scoot over to the other side of the line and go to college there. It was not a question of dollars and cents or of pay with them. They did not go overseas because they thought it was safer to be here.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend tries to make it out a virtue on the part of these young men that they are not fighting for dollars and cents. We all know that there is no money which can recompense men who go out and risk their lives. But that is no reason why we should not pay these men a fair wage. The question has nothing to do with what Great Britain or France pay their men. We are entitled to pay our men a fair day's wage for the time they put in just as well as we are entitled to pay men fairly whom we employ in ordinary labour. We have to pay a man employed in an ordinary occupation more than we

pay a man at the front. We know that the men at the front are not complaining at all. They did not join for the purpose of being paid a certain amount and we give them credit for that, but that is no reason why we should not see that they are properly paid.

Mr. McCOIG: I agree with my hon. friend from North Oxford as far as the pay proposition is concerned. The average single man who is working upon a farm in Ontario is receiving in the neighbourhood of \$500 or \$600 a year and his board. The argument is presented that in a great many cases he is only employed for a few months in the year, but in most cases the average farmer employs a man all the year round. If he employs a man for only six months he will have to pay him at a higher rate than \$1.10 a day. The average man employed on the farm gets \$2.50 a day and you can scarcely get them at that wage. During the remainder of the time these men are employed in the industries in the towns and cities. If we are going to compel men to go to the front we should not pay them less than we ought to pay them and we should not hesitate over a few cents per day. We should pay them the rate that we should be willing to accept ourselves if we were going and I do not think there is any one here who would be willing to go to the front for \$1.10 a day. I feel satisfied that the Prime Minister will look at it in that way. If we conscript men and compel them to go, we should see that they are fairly paid for their services. We are proud to see them go, they are going to defend us and I venture to say that there are not many of us here who are very anxious to go.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman think the argument is any stronger in favour of the men who will have to respond to this law than it will be in favour of men who went under voluntary enlistment?

Mr. McCOIG: I do not think there is any question that a man should be properly paid when it comes down to taking him away from an industry or employment in which he is getting \$2.50 or \$3 a day, and telling him that he has to go to the front to defend us. Shall we send men to the front to defend us for \$1.10 a day while we continue to prosper, make money and increase our bank accounts?

Sir HERBERT AMES: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a conscripted man should be paid more than a volunteer?