

not understand farming. They spent several years at the work, but in the end they lost everything, they were unable to pay one dollar of the money that was advanced to them, and the mortgage companies, or whoever advanced the money, took over the lands in lieu of the debt. In those days \$600 would buy almost as much as \$2,500 will buy to-day.

This policy may well be applied to men who know something about farming, but some other method should be adopted of giving a start to the men who are not accustomed to farm life or living long distances from towns. A better way of looking after returned soldiers who are not accustomed to farming would be to follow the example set by Alberta. There they have established schools in which men of education are trained to become school teachers, while those who are not fitted for teaching are put into a technical school and taught trades. By following this course, such men can be put in a position to earn a good living, with resulting advantage not only to themselves, but to the country generally. The Government will make a great mistake if they pass a general law under which returned soldiers from all parts of the Empire, inexperienced in agriculture, will come into Canada and occupy land. They get a quarter-section of land, we advance them \$2,500—and five years afterwards they will not be worth a dollar. It turned out that way in practically every instance in the past; why should the chances for success be any better now, especially in view of the fact that we are dealing with men who will not be content to live a long distance from railways, separated from social intercourse, and put up with the conditions that any man has to put up with who pioneers in a new country a long distance from railway communication? I know a good deal about it; I went through it myself. Many difficulties have to be overcome, and I say that only the men who are accustomed to life on the farm will make good under this proposal.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that if we were to follow the advice of the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) we should be discouraged from attempting to place upon the land any person who has not had experience in farming. As I have explained, the desire of the Government under this legislation is twofold: first, to do something for the returned soldier by placing him upon the land; secondly, to increase agricultural production. Every other

[Mr. Turriff.]

country is, with good hope of success, adopting a land policy, not confining it at all to those who were previously upon the land; I do not see why we should be discouraged from doing the same thing in Canada. The cases referred to by the member for Assiniboia are cases in which there was no supervision of the expenditure. In this instance the loan to the returned soldier will be expended under the supervision of the Board of Commissioners who will be appointed for that purpose. Besides, it is the intention to grant loans, not to persons inexperienced in agriculture, but only to those recommended by the Board of Commissioners, who will first satisfy themselves that the persons in question measure up to the qualifications set forth in this legislation. It is the intention to provide agricultural training for the men who have never had agricultural experience. Australia and New Zealand are encouraging soldiers to go on the land—not only their own soldiers, but British soldiers as well. We are safeguarded by advancing loans only to those who are recommended by the commissioners as being likely to make a success of agricultural work. And, as I have said, the commissioners have supervision over the expenditure of the money.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will this legislation apply to the soldiers of India?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does the Bill not so provide? What about British subjects from India?

Mr. ROCHE: The legislation defines "settler" as follows:

Any person who has served in the naval or military expeditionary forces of Canada during the present war, or who was engaged in active service during the present war in the naval or military forces of the United Kingdom or of any of the self-governing British dominions or colonies.

So that it does not apply to the class of persons referred to by my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Rainville in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to subsection (c), the minister will remember that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) made a certain suggestion in reference to the inclusion of citizens of Canada who