

he could possibly be in the trenches at this time. I do not think there is a chance in a thousand that a tribunal would send a man who was working on the land and producing food either for Canada or for export into the trenches where he would not be worth one-half as much. When I was in the West lately I learned of an old man who had a farm of 480 acres, a great deal of it under cultivation. He was working like a slave himself, with one hired man; he could not get any more help. While I was there two men drifted into the town and wanted jobs. This man saw them and they asked him \$6 a day, and would not consider anything less than \$5 a day. Any man who knows anything about farming in the West knows that, at this time of the year, before the crop is grown, no farmer can pay \$5 a day and board to a man and have anything left—he would go in the hole himself. I was wondering whether the Government had any idea of conscripting men for other purposes than sending them to the front. It seems to me that men who are walking around the country and trying to hold people up for \$5 a day for labour on the farm, are a class of men that it would not be bad policy to conscript. I would say to them: If you do not want to go and fight for your country, the least you can do is to produce food for the men who are fighting, and do so at \$2.50 or \$3 a day and your board. That is good big pay. I should like to see the conscription go far enough to make that class of man get to work and do one thing or the other. If he is not suitable to go to the trenches he should be made to produce food.

Mr. MORPHY: I beg to suggest a change in the wording of subsection (a) of section 11. That subsection reads:

(a) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged;

I think the phraseology is a little unfortunate. Instead of saying "is habitually engaged," it should read "has been for a certain period of time past habitually engaged." We might say at least one year prior to the passing of this Act, or at the time the war broke out. My idea is that exemptions under this Bill should be to real classes of the people. As the clause reads, hundreds of young men may rush to the farms who do not know anything about farming. They may have gone there during the last week, and under the phraseology here such young men could go to

the tribunal and say: I am farming, I am hired out and have been for a month—at exorbitant wages. In that way a man might escape service. I think that, in the interest of the country, there should be added to that clause the words "for at least one year prior to the passing of this Act."

Something should be added to indicate that he must be a real farmer, a real fisherman, a real something, and not a man who is attempting to avoid service by taking up one of these occupations. The same thing applies to clause (f) in relation to conscientious objectors. The clause reads:

That he conscientiously objects to the undertaking of combatant service and is prohibited from so doing by the tenets and articles of faith, in effect at the date of the passing of this Act, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada at such date, and to which he in good faith belongs; and if any of the grounds of such application be established, a certificate of exemption shall be granted to such man.

I would change that section to read "that existed before the 4th of August, 1914," being the time of the declaration of war. I do not know whether any one knows what orders have arisen in view of the possibilities of such an Act as this. The section as it reads now would apply to any coterie of persons who would say: We belong to a certain branch of a sect well known and organized in Canada. I think there should be a time limit there.

Mr. BRADBURY: If a man does not want to defend the state he should not have citizenship, no matter who he is.

Mr. MORPHY: There are certain people who have conscientious objections to combatant service and are protected by the law. My objection is to having others slip in and say they are exempted when they are not. In other words, a real conscientious objector should be exempted.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I think the amendment before us is too broad, to start with, and it is very questionable whether it is required at all. I agree with the hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) and the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) who both have had some experience in this matter. I do not think it is necessary that we should use the term suggested in regard to those engaged in agricultural or industrial pursuits, especially the latter, because it is altogether too broad. We use the term "industrial," and it covers almost everything in the coun-