

I must say this, and I say it with the best feeling: I do not think speeches such as have been made by my hon. friend and his colleague who sits immediately behind him give any help to the soldier settlement problem. It is wrong to give the impression that the soldiers are being pressed, are being harried, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. WRIGHT: I did not say that.

Mr. CRERAR: But the hon. gentleman's colleague behind him did. He said it was shameful treatment—

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It is, too.

Mr. CRERAR: —and used other expressions of that kind. That, certainly, is intemperate and unwise language. Why, there are 550 of these soldier settlers on the land who benefited to the extent of \$155,000 last year under the War Veterans' Allowance Act. That is the shameful treatment which the government is handing out to these men. It is a mistake to say that they are driven off their land. There are hundreds of these settlers who have no prospect of ever paying for their land, who are not being disturbed because they have a home there. My hon. friend suggested that they should be legislated into an equity. The hon. member for Yorkton stated that they should be given title to their land.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: No, I did not.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, my hon. friend made that statement.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There are cases where it should be done.

Mr. CRERAR: There are some of these farmers, if you gave them their land, gave them full possession, in three or four or five years time their position would be just as bad as it is to-day. That is not an exaggerated statement. The inspectors doing this work are sympathetic men. They are practically all returned men themselves. The director is a returned man, and he knows the problems. The administration is just as sympathetic as is the hon. member for Yorkton. I wish to protest against the intemperate language which the hon. member has used to-night in this discussion.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Apparently I shall have to bring more cases to the house. I shall be pleased to do so by the dozen.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CRERAR: Is there any objection to calling one item in Labour?

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

100. Departmental administration, \$166,231.

Item stands.

Mr. CRERAR: I am very grateful to the committee for going on an hour longer, and for the assistance they have given in making the progress we have made.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Saturday.

Saturday, August 1, 1942.

The house met at eleven o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

MOTION TO SIT WHILE HOUSE IS IN SESSION—
QUESTION OF CONTENTIOUS DIVORCE
BILL—MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. W. P. TELFORD (Grey North) moved:

That the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills be empowered to sit while the house is sitting.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): On this question of the committee on private bills sitting while the house is sitting, may I point out that the bill in question here is a very contentious one. It has just been contested in the other place and, so far as I am concerned, I must say that the sitting of this committee would be nothing more or less than a farce. I believe all members feel the same way. As I say, it has been a matter of contention in the committee in the other place, and in my opinion it is simply wasting our time to take it into consideration now, in the dying days of the session. I protest against the House of Commons having to take the responsibility of passing on the bill that will be before us if this motion is agreed to.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I wish to say a word in this connection as well. I had intended to speak at some length on this bill because I have studied it carefully. I agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ross) that there has never been a bigger farce before the house. After a careful reading of the evidence I cannot find any proof brought forward to warrant our proceeding with the bill. The people who are applying for this petition have definitely failed to prove their case. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) some time ago brought forward a similar case. He spoke on it at considerable length, and pointed out that it was a shame to go through with it. I must join with the hon. member who has spoken in