

I think it is perfectly right, as it leaves the homesteader all the opportunities he had before to count his residence from the date of entry or from the date when he went into residence on his homestead. He has all the advantages he has had up to the present, and he has one more opportunity, of getting his six months in in each year for three years. He had not that option before and to that extent, in my judgment, the amendment is to the advantage of the homesteader, and I think it should carry.

Mr. ROCHE: That was the idea.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to say that I probably represent a larger proportion of homestead area than any other member, and in my judgment I would desire that the minister should make the change as suggested.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is the argument presented by the hon. member for Assiniboia that it gives the homesteader one more advantage, correct? If it is, for Heaven's sake let us give it to him, he has hard times now.

Mr. OLIVER: It gives the Administration one more opportunity to grant or withhold, with or without cause, and thereby create dissatisfaction amongst the settlers, and retards settlement. It was because of that that the change was made in 1906, and the change was followed by a stupendous success in the homesteading, not only in the volume of homesteading, but in the satisfaction between the homesteaders and the Government. There was no other period in the homestead history of Canada when there was as much satisfaction between the homesteader and the Government as during that period and under that law. All that I am asking is that that provision, which was placed there for good reasons, be continued in the interests of the homesteader.

Mr. TURRIFF: At present, when the homesteader applies for a patent, he either goes to the land office and interviews the official there, or he gives notice, and the homestead inspector comes to the settler. The officials in the land office and the homestead inspector are all well posted as to just how a homesteader can apply for and secure his patent, and I venture to say there is not one case in ten where the homesteader does not consult with the officials and the inspector, and makes his application as prescribed by these officers. Many of the homesteaders do not understand the regulations absolutely, and it

comes back to the same thing, that this gives the homesteader one more opportunity and it does not take away one single iota of the advantage that he has at the present time. If the regulation governing what is proposed here is published, I do not see that any official of the department can vary it once it is published.

Mr. ROCHE: Apparently the views of the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) harmonize with my own views, and I have as much right to pay attention to the views of the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia as I have to pay attention to the views of any other member of the House. I should like to have his criticism of the section, and also the criticism of other members from the West. I should like to get their opinion on it before consenting to revert back to the former legislation. I have not any strong views myself. I want to do anything I can to aid the homesteader and make it easier for him, whilst imposing the usual duties on him. That is the only object I had in view, and I should like to know just exactly the feeling of the other members from the West with regard to the change I have suggested.

Mr. BRADBURY: I was not in the House when the discussion commenced, but I do not see why the hon. gentleman from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is objecting to the amended section. I represent a large number of homesteaders, and I have, time after time, realized that the law as it stood militated against the homesteader, and I for one in this House felt that we should do everything we could to assist the homesteader. The changes are simple, giving the homesteader another opportunity of making good and performing his work. I think it would be a policy that would be condemned by the homesteaders all through the West, and by every member in this House, if we proposed to do anything at all that would militate against the homesteader, and I should like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to reconsider his attitude.

Mr. OLIVER: I am unable to find any word in this section that gives the homesteader any right that he does not possess under the previous section, but, by the omission of the words in the previous section, I can see very plainly that those who are in charge of the administration of the law can take away from the homesteader rights which he might very well think he had, and that is something I do not wish to see. I desire to avoid friction between the homesteaders and the Administration, but