dier upon that land taking over the obligations that the man left, but if the board places anybody except a soldier on the land it can only do so with the approval of the minister and the Governor in Council.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the board have to get the full price of the land from another soldier?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They could only sell to some one other than a soldier with the approval of the minister, and they can only sell for anything less than what they have against the land after a full recital of the circumstances by the board and the approval of the Governor in Council. They cannot lose anything on the land except by the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. CAHILL: What action do you contemplate against the soldier who has abandoned that land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is liable for it, but a judgment against one who abandons land under these circumstances, will, I am afraid, not be of much value.

Mr. CAHILL: You may keep the liability?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We may keep the liability on the books.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not very familiar with some of the decisions in the courts in the West that have been going further in recognizing equities than we have been in the Eastern provinces. That is where a man enters upon land and pays a certain amount of money for it, and fails, I have read some western decisions in which it is still held that the man was entitled to anything that he has forfeited. That is to say where the land was worth $2,000 and he had paid $1,500, and was unable to pay the balance and had to abandon the land, I notice that the courts, not dealing with the Crown, but in cases involving private individuals, have given some recognition to the rights of the settler, although he was not able to carry out the agreement to the full extent. I do not know whether the Minister is familiar with these cases or not; possibly the circumstances are different when the man is dealing with the Crown. In this Bill, I observe, the absolute right is taken away.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The decisions to which my hon. friend refers are of comparatively recent years and do go a long way in the nature of recognizing the equity of redemption and even the payment the man has made, upon cancellation. They have no relevance now because sub-section 3 wipes them off and declares finally in statutory form that there is no equity in redemption, and there is no right of claim upon the moneys paid. That being done, of course, the courts are quite powerless to enter and pronounce against the authority of Parliament.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite understand that, but my position is as to whether the minister recognizes the fairness of the principles laid down by these decisions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The King can do no wrong.

Mr. PEDLOW: Suppose a returned soldier took up a section of land under this Bill and carried it for, say, five, or eight, or ten years, and then died. Would his widow have an equity in the property?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it provided for in the Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all provided for. His estate has the same right in respect to that land as the man himself possessed. All it has to do is to comply with the requirements, and it will be given the same right and protection.

Section agreed to.

On section 25—advances for the discharge of encumbrances.

Mr. COOPER: Under this Bill, a man that owns his farm, but has an encumbrance against it of more than $2,500, cannot take advantage of this legislation. Would it not be possible for the minister to reconsider that provision?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The War Veterans Association have pressed upon me a reconsideration of this clause in the direction suggested by my hon. friend. It will be recalled that I stated that as regards the man who owned his land and merely wanted an advance for the purpose of wiping off encumbrances, we did not feel we ought to do the same as in the case of a man who was purchasing the land to become a settler, because in the latter instance we are adding a new settler, whereas in the former, we are merely exercising the functions of a loan company—we are not doing anything for settlement at all. We do not want to get into that field any more than we can avoid, so we adopted the maximum of $2,500 which was fixed by the 1917 Act s