

and take up his 160 acres of land and get free entry by doing the settlement duties prescribed by the statute. The soldier gets no advantage in that. The minister says: We are making provision to lend each soldier \$2,000. That is the only difference, as I understand it, between the soldier and any other individual. The soldier is to have the advantage of a loan made to him under the provisions of this Act and under the supervision of the commissioners to be appointed under it, the sum not to exceed \$2,000, and instructions in agriculture, which will be open to any one, as the leader of the Opposition has already stated. The only advantage that the soldier is to get will be the advance to him of \$2,000. The minister says that this provision is being made not as a reward to the soldier but in the interest of settlement.

Mr. ROCHE: I said it was made for both purposes.

Mr. GERMAN: Very well; if it is in the interest of settlement, why is not provision made for an advance of \$2,000 to any other person in addition to free entry to 160 acres of land? Why confine it to the soldier? If you appoint your commissioners and say: We will grant free entry to 160 acres of land to any person who will go and work that 160 acres, you will not be giving the soldier any advantage over any other person. We want to get soldiers and others. Then, why not make this further provision in order to induce settlement, in order to bring people here, soldiers or others, soldiers preferably if we can get them, but any other good, honest, intelligent working men who want to take up land, that they may have free entry to 160 acres of land? Say to them: Perform your settlement duties and you will obtain your grant and, further, we will lend you \$2,000. Why confine it to soldiers if it is to be an act to increase population and to bring in settlers? It is not granted as a reward if I understand the minister right. It is not being suggested as a reward. It is being suggested—to help the soldier? Very well, we all agree with that. But, it is not being suggested as a reward. It is being suggested as an inducement to settlement. If it is an inducement to settlement, make it world wide. Give the \$2,000, under proper restrictions, under the supervision of the commission you are going to appoint. Appoint men such as the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) has suggested, who are intelligent and proper men to administer such a law, and make

a provision allowing \$2,000 to every person in this country, unless you are going to limit it simply to soldiers. I would not say that there is an ulterior motive in this.

Mr. ROCHE: Then the hon. gentleman is not in favour of giving the soldier preferential treatment?

Mr. GERMAN: I am absolutely in favour of giving the soldier preferential treatment but the minister is not proposing to give this preferential treatment. He is saying this is not preferential treatment; he has already stated that. The minister has already stated that this is not preferential treatment but that it is to encourage settlement. If it is to encourage settlement, make it world wide, make it for settlement and not for soldiers. If it is for soldiers, give the soldier 160 acres of land without settlement duties. Then you are faced with the question that the minister referred to in connection with the South African scrip. The land may be sold next day after the beneficiary obtains the scrip. It must be put upon a business basis if it is to be made effective. I will support the

10 p.m. minister in every effort he can make to bring about, not only greater settlement in the Northwest, but to confer a real advantage on the returned soldier. But let us have it on a business basis and let us put it in such a way that it will be effective and immediately available to the soldier upon his return.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to discuss this resolution at any length. I must, however, congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) on the measure which he intends to introduce, with a view, as he says, of giving the soldier a preference. I much prefer this legislation to the proposed land scheme which was launched in England, and which has been so much advertised in the press of late. Although the names in connection with that scheme were big names, I think there was too much speculation in it, and I am, therefore, very much pleased to see that this legislation is introduced. When my hon. friend gave notice of this legislation some time ago I asked him if it would apply to Canadian soldiers. He answered that it would apply to all of the soldiers who had served the King within the British Empire. So far so good. As my hon. friend has stated, this legislation has for its object primarily the settlement of the lands in the West, and as after this war Canada will need a very pro-