

out of which he intended to make a living. The Act provided that the board should buy a farm for him to work, and, I repeat, it specifically stated that when the time came for him to get his title he should not get title to the minerals. I know that the thing can be argued pro and con, ad infinitum, without our reaching any conclusion. The department takes one view and some of us take the other.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. the ACTING SPEAKER: When shall the Bill be read a third time?

Hon. Mr. COTE: Does the House not think this Bill should go to a committee? If what has been said by the honourable senator from Saltcoats (Hon. Mr. Calder) is true, a rather strong argument made by the honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) falls to the ground. The matter is one which I think many of us would like to see investigated before third reading is given. The honourable senator from Saltcoats has said that when the board purchased land for a settler the mineral rights were not included, because the vendor did not own them.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Oh, yes, the vendor owned the mineral rights. The Crown had divested itself of them.

Hon. Mr. COTE: In some cases it did, and in some cases it did not. The vendor could not sell the mineral rights if they were reserved to the Crown. Under the proposed amendment, in the case of purchase of land from a vendor who could not sell the mineral rights because they were held by the Crown, it would seem that the board could now transfer these rights to the settler. This certainly would not be right, because it is not possible to argue that the settler expected to have the mineral rights.

Here is another point. Even if we agree with the honourable leader's argument that in the case where the board purchased land with its mineral rights for a certain price and resold the land to a settler at the same price, the settler could expect to get everything the board bought, including the mineral rights, that argument would apply only to the original settler.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is what the Act says.

Hon. Mr. COTE: But it would not apply to a resale. I understand that in a great many cases the farms have been taken back by the board and resold, and the original settlers are no longer on them.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It is the original settler who has paid all his obligations.

Hon. Mr. COTE: The law uses the term "settlers." It is not limited to original settlers.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: You will find that expression there.

Hon. Mr. COTE: If it is there, my second point is answered.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I hesitate to move third reading now. I am agreeable to having the Bill sent to a committee, to give my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) an opportunity to meet the legal adviser of the department. I have read with considerable interest the statement from the department, and it seemed they had made a very clear case in favour of the original settlers for whom they had acted as agent.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: They did not act as agent at all.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I think that is what my right honourable friend himself said.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not. They did not act as agent at all.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Here is what my right honourable friend said in 1919:

We do buy land and resell it to soldiers, but the plan of operation is to allow the soldier to select his land first—not from the land we own, but wherever he wants it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND:

He selects his farm, he comes to an arrangement as to what he is prepared to pay, and then the office of the board is, through its inspector, to see that he is not paying too much and, if necessary, to have the price reduced before the board will itself purchase the land. The price having been brought down to a satisfactory basis, the board buys the land for the soldier and accompanies the purchase by a resale agreement to him.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Surely this means that the settler gets exactly what the board bought for him, not merely half of it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He gets what the Act says.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The board supplies the money for the purchase of a farm, because the soldier settler has not the necessary amount in his pocket, and it says to him: "You may reimburse us by instalments, and when you have completed them, the property will be yours." Surely it was not in my right honourable friend's mind that the board should make any money by the transaction.