

*Soldier Settlement*

Battleford (Mr. McIntosh), asked me a question in connection with soldier settlers. This question, which is to be found on page 1147 of Hansard, is as follows:

I have a question to direct to the Minister of Labour. I have in my possession correspondence in connection with a returned soldier by the name of F. N. Murphy, of northern Saskatchewan, who joined the first battalion early in the war and was demobilized in 1919. When he returned he was placed on land purchased by his father. The father never lived on the land, the soldier himself having lived there from the time it was purchased. Since this man has not had any revaluation of that land, no discount, while others who apparently were never in the front line trenches have had a revaluation, will the minister investigate the matter and see that justice is meted out to this returned man, who is trying to make a living on that land in northern Saskatchewan.

I made answer from memory to that question yesterday, but since then I have had an opportunity to inquire into the details of the matter and my answer of yesterday is borne out by the fact. Shortly put, Eugene Murphy, father of F. N. Murphy, the man to whom reference was made, entered into an agreement as a civilian with the then soldier settlement board on September 13, 1921, to purchase the west half of 28-47-6—west of the third meridian. Neither in the application to purchase nor in the agreement for sale nor in any subsequent correspondence between the department and Eugene Murphy was there any intent disclosed that he was merely buying this land for his son.

With respect to revaluation of soldier settlers' lands, I would refer the hon. member to section 68 of the Soldier Settlement Act. At the time the revaluation amendment was passed in 1927, F. N. Murphy was not a settler who had agreed to purchase any land from the board and consequently, although a returned soldier, was not entitled to benefit under that legislation. The father, Eugene Murphy, who had agreed to purchase the property from the board, being a civilian, was not entitled to benefit under the revaluation measure. The legislation with respect to the thirty per cent reduction became effective on May 30, 1930. On the decease of Eugene Murphy, the executor assigned the title and interest of the late Eugene Murphy in the agreement to which I have made reference to F. N. Murphy. F. N. Murphy was at no time qualified or established in accordance with the provisions of the act and regulations, which latter are statutory and define the powers of the department with respect to the establishment of settlers and the manner in which settlers may be qualified with a view to

[Mr. Gordon]

such establishment. It may be observed further that F. N. Murphy is a settler who holds, not an agreement for sale with the department, but an assignment and extension of his late father's agreement and is not eligible under the provisions of the amendment above referred to to participate in the benefits thereunder.

The position is very plain. I was not a member of the House of Commons when the legislation was passed in 1927. I have no complaint to make as to the effect of that legislation, but I am sure that the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) in making the observations he did yesterday was misinformed as to what the facts were. I believe that he was a member of this chamber when that legislation was passed and must have known that the soldier to whom he referred could not by any stretch of the imagination become entitled to a revaluation under the legislation.

Mr. J. K. BLAIR (North Wellington): While what the minister has said might be correct, I think there are extenuating circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Is the hon. member going to ask a question? There is no motion before the house and there is nothing to debate. If the hon. member has a point of order to state he has the right to state it.

Mr. BLAIR: I think in view of the extenuating circumstances in Mr. Murphy's case some leniency should be shown—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I cannot see that any point of order is involved in that.

Mr. McINTOSH: May I say briefly in reply to the Minister of Labour—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled already that there is nothing before the house. If the hon. member wishes to ask a question he is at perfect liberty to do so.

Mr. McINTOSH: Then I shall if this is the only method of approach open to me. May I ask the Minister of Labour a question arising out of his answer regarding the case of F. N. Murphy of northern Saskatchewan? Must I take the answer which he has given me to-day as final, meaning that there is no further redress for this returned soldier on the land?

An hon. MEMBER: You will look after him.