

served in the forces of the Allied countries. There are some such cases, and the hon. member was anxious to know if the minister could see his way clear to accept that suggestion.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. member for Bonaventure particularly referred to the French and the Belgian reservists who were summoned to the colours and who were citizens of Canada. I have an amendment here to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman. I beg to move:

That subsection (c) of section 2 be amended by inserting after the word "Colonies" in the fifteenth line, the words "or who being a British subject resident in Canada before the war has been engaged in active service at one of the seats of war in either the naval or military forces of any of His Majesty's Allies in the present war."

Mr. TURRIFF: A few minutes ago the minister stated that in the past the classes of people who had failed under a system something like this were people who had settled on the land and been given advances of money, the expenditure of which was not subject to supervision. I know of two colonies that were settled under somewhat similar conditions and that were under very strict supervision, and success did not result. Take the crofter settlement of Moosomin and the crofter settlement in the vicinity of Killarney in southern Manitoba. These were well supervised; the men were put on the land and given an advance of \$600. And yet not 2 per cent of them made good. They lost their land, and they lost that money. The parties who advanced the money took the land back in the end, and it was only after many years of experience in the country that these settlers, after starting absolutely on their own account without a dollar, began to make some advancement and to meet with some success. While it might be all right to incur a loss of \$2,500 in the case of any of our returned soldiers, when you come to run the risk of incurring a loss of \$2,500 on any soldier from any of the other parts of the Empire who chooses to come here and who may be passed upon the commission, the country is undertaking to spend many millions of dollars and will probably incur a loss of millions without helping on development. I am absolutely convinced that, with the exception of men who are accustomed to farming, not two per cent of the returned soldiers who settle on the land will succeed.

Mr. ROCHE: They will have to prove their ability to the satisfaction of the commission.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Boards.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that the commissioners may be removed at any time by the Governor in Council for cause. Those commissioners will have very important powers, and it is, I assume, desired by the Government that in matters of administration they should exercise those powers as a commission without let or hindrance on the part of the Government. That is to say, the Government will lay down certain limits within which this board shall have full power to act. Does not this provision in regard to the dismissal of the commissioners hold them under the authority of the Government to a degree that is not altogether desirable? If it is the idea of the Government to have the commission independent of departmental administration, it would seem to me that the appointment should be made somewhat more permanent than it is in this section. I am not urging that that should be the policy of the Government, but if it is the Government's policy then the wording of the section should give a greater guarantee of independence on the part of the commission.

Mr. ROCHE: This is not a new provision; you will find it in the appointment of the Railway Commission. I think this was drafted from the wording of that appointment. There has been no suspicion even of anything there in the nature of political control. The term "for cause" means for some very grave cause, for instance, if one of the commissioners were to become demented, or anything of that nature, or if some irregularity occurred.

Mr. OLIVER: If this provision is parallel to that in the Railway Commission, it ought to be satisfactory.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Dominion lands to be reserved.

Mr. OLIVER: When we were discussing the resolution, I raised a question as to the advisability of what might be called permanent reservations, such as are contemplated by this section. While we desire to meet the purposes of the Bill by giving priority of right to those taking advantage of the provisions of the Bill, we do not wish unduly to prejudice the ordinary settlement of the country. I think at the time I suggested to the minister and