

there was great difficulty. The soldier was anxious to avail himself of the free land grant, but not to settle on the land. This was unjust to adjoining settlers and retarded development. These returned soldiers must become settlers?

Mr. ROCHE: Undoubtedly they must be permanent settlers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: So that the returned soldier does not receive much favour in respect of the land, but he receives this loan of \$2,500, at a rate of interest not much below the ordinary rate, with which he can start operations. I should think that to induce the soldiers to go on the land some further inducement will be necessary. I am glad that the Bill is to apply to other provinces than those in which the Dominion holds lands. Otherwise there would be discrimination against the older provinces. After their experience as soldiers I doubt if these men would wish to settle on isolated farms, and by the provision enabling the purchase of lands they can be given farms in the older provinces where they may be more comfortably settled. I was impressed by the measure introduced this afternoon to assess large incomes for carrying on the war. The soldier is making the greatest sacrifice, and it is only right that the rich man at home should give of his wealth to assist in carrying on the war. I think our treatment of the returned soldiers should be generous, that we should do even more than is proposed by this Bill. Many of these men will not like the idea of going into the newer districts and becoming pioneers after their experience of the last few years.

Mr. OLIVER: I have the authority of Lord Shaughnessy in support of a view which I advanced on the same line as the argument of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I said that it would be economical and in the interest of rapid increase of production if prairie land not under cultivation, but situated in the vicinity of railroad communication were expropriated at a fair price and then distributed among the soldiers on fair terms. With the financial assistance given them by this Bill they can bring that land into production in the shortest possible time. We should be getting a return upon our investment, and the soldier himself would be doing better than if he became a pioneer. But it may be said that that would increase the investment of the country on behalf of the soldier. It

does and it does not. It does increase the initial investment required in payment of the expropriated land. That would be an additional amount, but it would be no additional risk. The \$2,500 would be a loan to the soldier to purchase stock and machinery upon which the Government would hold a lien, and of course the land would be worth what the Government paid for it. If the payment for the land were extended over a long period of years at a moderate rate of interest, while the original investment of the Government would be increased, the risk of loss would not only not be increased, but would be very greatly lessened, and the results in the matter of increased production and of self-support by the soldier would be reached in a very much shorter time. I observe provision in section 5 empowering the Government to take such action as I have suggested. Is that in contemplation?

Mr. ROCHE: The principal reason for putting that in is to enable any soldier who desires to go on land other than Dominion land to acquire land wherever he likes. It is thought better that he should buy the land than that the Government should expropriate it. If, as has been suggested, we are going to lose a lot of money under our free land grant and the advance of \$2,500 to the soldier, the country would be much more involved if, in addition, we expended millions in expropriating lands which might remain on our hands for a long time. It is true we should have the lands, which would be of value, but in war times we have better use for our money than buying lands which may not be required even for the purposes of settlement for years to come. This provision is to enable the soldier to purchase land wherever he may desire. He can use the money in clearing the land and getting started.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not the originator of this suggestion; I first saw it mentioned on the authority of Lord Shaughnessy, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that everybody must pay some respect to a suggestion in regard to land settlement coming from such a source, especially in view of the fact that the organization of which Lord Shaughnessy is the head is the owner of a large amount of unoccupied land. He said that he was prepared, on behalf of the company, to take the same chance as anybody else and have the land expropriated for this purpose. While the policy of the Government does not at the moment contemplate any such action, under this subsection, it would be possible