

charity; he is simply asking for pay for services rendered. The government in this case have something they have not paid for, and I think it is the duty of the minister to try to find some means of doing justice so far as this man is concerned.

Mr. ADSHEAD: If this were a private matter the man could file a workman's lien and that would stand before any other debt. I do not think it is quite fair, because the government occupies a peculiar position, that it should simply ignore a responsibility which any ordinary private individual would have to meet. If in private matters it is simple honesty that a workman's wages should take priority to any other claim, surely to goodness the government will not act less honestly.

Mr. FORKE: I thoroughly sympathize with the carpenter in this case, which seems a hard one. We took the advice of the Department of Justice, but if there is any way whereby we can meet the situation I shall be glad to take the matter up again with a view to having the man paid.

Mr. LUCAS: I thank the minister very much, and I hope he will not say definitely that he will do nothing.

Mr. FORKE: I am not trying to get out of it.

Mr. LUCAS: As the hon. member for East Calgary has pointed out, if this were private and not government property the man could file a lien and have his bill paid. Is the government going to take a different stand from the position which any ordinary individual would find himself in, and refuse to pay the man?

Mr. FORKE: My hon. friend must bear in mind that we have to deal with a large number of soldier settlers, and if they could incur private liabilities and charge them to us we do not know what the government would be let in for. The principle is bad; the hon. member can readily see that. Of course, this carpenter has some recourse in relation to the individual who had the farm in the first place. However, I will look into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr. LUCAS: I would point out to the minister that in the first instance the officials of his department were lax in this matter. They allowed Ogilvie to get into the condition we see in this case and get away scot free, and therefore I say there was laxity on their part.

Mr. FORKE: This was ten years ago.

Mr. LUCAS: I know; and this man has been out of his pay all these years. The man is trying to make a living and it is a real hardship on him. The people of that district are incensed over the affair. This man has been held up in connection with \$480 worth of work and the whole thing has left a bad feeling in the district. I hope the minister will find some way of settling the question.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The first of the two items comprising this vote is for advances and for administration costs. How much of it will be used for further advances to settlers and how much will be taken up in costs?

Mr. FORKE: To soldier settlers for taxes, insurance premiums, seed and feed, refund of surplus on resale, initial payment returns, general land settlement, and so on, \$690,000.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: And the balance is for costs of administration.

Mr. FORKE: There is \$690,000 for advances and \$755,000 for administration.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: How many men were originally placed under this act and how many are there at present on the land?

Mr. FORKE: There went on the land originally 31,360 soldier settlers. Soldier settlers who were granted loans numbered 24,484 and 224 Indian soldier settlers were established, making a total of 24,708 under this particular head. Soldier entries without loan numbered 6,652, bringing the total up to 31,360. Active settlers now on the land number 13,778.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Thirteen thousand out of thirty thousand?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is worse than I thought.

Mr. FORKE: Of course, only 24,484 got loans from the board. There were 6,000 soldiers who took up homesteads without loans.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Of that 24,000 the minister mentions there are 13,000 left on the land.

Mr. FORKE: Yes. There are 1,266 soldier settlers who have paid off loans and these must be added to the 13,000.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The minister is adding those 6,000 to the 13,000. What was the outstanding indebtedness in the fall of 1922? What was the original outstanding indebtedness and how much has been paid? In other words, what proportion of the moneys has been returned?