

have reviewed coming from many hundreds of settlers I think the change was desirable, and I know it is working out very well.

Mr. SANDERSON: One member now takes the place of the former three; is that member an ex-service man?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, and one with a very fine overseas record.

Mr. DUFF: Which two men were let out, and what positions did they hold?

Mr. GORDON: Colonel Rattray, the chairman, and Mr. Maber, one of the commissioners, who was not an ex-service man and who had a substantial superannuation. I am told that his superannuation amounted to about \$3,600.

Mr. DUFF: Why was Colonel Rattray let out when he had been chairman of the board, and when he had advised that the board be reduced from three to one? Why was he not kept on as the one remaining member, instead of bringing in an outsider?

Mr. GORDON: I was never advised that Colonel Rattray suggested the reduction. Certainly he never did so at any time to me.

Mr. DUFF: I do not suppose he had a chance, when you fired him.

Mr. GORDON: Well now—

Mr. DUFF: Would the minister give us the reason why Colonel Rattray was let out? He was chairman of the board, an ex-soldier, a good business man, and there were no complaints against him.

Mr. GORDON: Because I believed I was getting a better man to take charge. I do not make that statement as any reflection upon Colonel Rattray, who I believe was a fine soldier and a gentleman. However, after making a complete survey from coast to coast I concluded that a stranger and an outsider should be put in charge, and I think the efficiency of the department has amply justified the change.

Mr. DUFF: Who was the gentleman put in charge?

Mr. GORDON: Thomas Magladery.

Mr. DUFF: Where did he come from?

Mr. GORDON: Originally he came from Edmonton, and subsequently lived in New Liskeard. He was appointed in October, 1930, by the old board composed of Colonel Rattray and the other two commissioners, to make a survey on all phases of soldier land settlement.

Mr. SANDERSON: On the recommendation of the minister, of course?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, on my recommendation. I may say there was no division of opinion among the members of the board as to the necessity for doing it. Prior to that he had made a general survey among and had organized the sales forces of a large agricultural machinery company operating in the three western prairie provinces. He was well acquainted with the situation with respect to settlers generally and with those in the west particularly.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, if I understand my geography the place from which this gentleman came who was appointed after Colonel Rattray was the town of New Liskeard, which is in the constituency of my hon. friend the minister. In other words he appointed a man from his own constituency and dismissed a good servant of the public who had served overseas.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith, Cumberland): Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DUFF: We want Rattray put back.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, April 25, 1932

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 54, for the relief of Georgina Linda McIndoe Howard.—Mr. White (Mount Royal).

Bill No. 55, for the relief of Antonio Polisenio.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 56, for the relief of Dorothy Gert-rude Silcock Wilson.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 57, for the relief of Beulah Isobel Phillips Eakin.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 58, for the relief of George Seymour Dixon.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 59, for the relief of Audrey Meredith Mann Redpath.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 60, for the relief of Ethel Seigler Nissenson.—Mr. Jacobs.