

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No. We do that so we will know that they understand they cannot get another loan.

Mr. CARTER: The act does not compel you to require them to do that.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Not at all. It is an indication that we have told this man if he wants a further loan he has to leave the title with us and if he takes it out he is finished. It is just an indication of that. However, there is the continuing establishment provision. Anyone who sold their farm before the legislation was passed in 1949 can come back and, with the authority of the governor in council, be given a second establishment the same as someone who would sell today and ask for second establishment at the time of sale.

Mr. CARTER: What would be the position of the veteran who refused to sign the waiver and still left his title?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: He does not have to sign.

Mr. CARTER: So he would be eligible under the act for more money.

Mr. FORGIE: If he asked you for a receipt saying he was paid up in full, would you give him a receipt?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. FORGIE: Or he could leave the title with you.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes. It is an indication that we have told him: here is your title if you want it, but if you take it you cannot get a further loan under part III of the act.

Mr. FORTIN: If he does not take it, is he entitled to a second loan?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It would not make any difference.

Mr. HERRIDGE: The principle of second establishment under the Veterans Land Act has been in effect partially since 1949.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. LALONDE: Under certain circumstances well defined in the act.

Mr. THOMAS: Could we call that a second establishment or a double establishment?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: A continuing establishment; it is on another property but it is the same contract.

Mr. LALONDE: These are veterans who have not earned their conditional grant. In 1949 the law was amended because there were certain provisions which had to be changed. It was because of these provisions that these people had not had a chance to earn their conditional grant, so they were given the chance of a second establishment because of a flaw in the legislation at that time. They earned only one conditional grant in the end.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Speakman is asking the committee to consider giving these veterans the advantage of our once again remedying a defect in the law.

Mr. FORGIE: How many illustrations or examples have you of people who are asking for this amendment?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I have but one complaint.

Mr. FORGIE: Would it not be a simple matter when his loan is paid, that he be told as long as he leaves the title with you he can secure a second loan, but if he takes the title away from you he cannot secure that loan.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is exactly what we are doing. We warn the man that if he takes title he cannot have a part III loan and as evidence of the fact we have warned him, we have him sign this certificate so he cannot say that he was not told.

Mr. LENNARD: Is that warning verbal?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Oh, yes, except he signs the certificate.