

he at once becomes liable for an indictable offence. He may have done it most innocently. The word 'knowingly' should be inserted before the word 'sell?' It should be qualified in some way.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is not a case of that kind that is contemplated.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I know that, but it may occur.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—How would it affect a case in which a homesteader had occupied his land for the full term and had complied with all the settlement conditions, and that he had borrowed money for the purpose of carrying on the occupation of farming, and for the purpose of buying agricultural implements, would he be subject to an indictable offence, if he, before obtaining a patent, sold it in order to raise money to pay his debts?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Yes.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, that would not be within the spirit of the Act. It is not framed to meet a case of that kind. It is only the executive that could put the law in force in a case of that sort.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—But as you have vested the minister with power to forgive perjury under another clause, why not add to this clause 'unless otherwise decided by the minister.'

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—The minister is not given power to condone the offence, but to permit re-entry.

The subclause was adopted.

On clause 32,

32. Agricultural lands shall only be open for purchase under regulations made by the Governor in Council; and there shall be no sale to one person under such regulations of an area of land in excess of one section, without a special order of the Governor in Council: Provided, however, that the minister may sell a fractional quarter-section, with or without homestead conditions, at a rate not to be less than three dollars per acre.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I doubt the propriety or expediency of permitting the minister to sell at a rate of not less than \$3 an acre. That seems to be a very unwise

provision. It practically places a value upon lands which are recognized to be well worth three times that amount at least. Why should the price remain now at three dollars, when values have gone far beyond that?

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I am sure the hon. gentleman from Calgary must know that there might be lands which would not be worth more than three dollars per acre.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Supposing the land would be worth double that?

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I would expect the minister to get double the price.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I do not see why the minister should sell a fractional quarter section. Considering what has already transpired in the alienation of lands in this country, this power should be vested in the Governor in Council and not in the minister.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—It is only a fractional quarter section which may be sold without the sanction of the Governor in Council. It is only a small portion.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It might be very valuable land. I move that the last three lines be stricken out.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—A great many sales have been made where there is a fractional piece of property adjoining a man's homestead alongside of a lake.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Why can the Governor in Council not do it? You make provision for anything beyond that to be dealt with by the Governor in Council. I cannot see why he cannot regulate the whole matter.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—It is a small thing to ask the Governor in Council to deal with.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It might be valuable.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Of course it is a very difficult thing to judge. It is only a fractional part in which the minister is allowed to use his discretion. For large areas he must go to the Governor in Council.