

suggestion of the hon. gentleman were taken, it would simply mean an absolute waste of \$50,000 a year, because the lists have to be burned; there is no space to hold them.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Then why not change the law? I am not saying it should be done immediately, but under the law as it exists every representative of a county and every defeated candidate should have 20 copies of the list as soon as they are printed. That requirement of the law has not been complied with. I ask why do we not get our lists immediately, and I am told there is too much work in the Bureau. The law has been infringed with the cognizance of the government.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The government must exercise common sense. They do not spend \$50,000 printing lists to make a bonfire of them.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—How can we tell that on the eve of an election we shall get the list?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Because the whole force is turned on, and an overflow is sent to Toronto and Montreal and officials have to go there to be present at the printing where there is an office that has the capacity.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—When did that law come into force?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Eleven years ago.

#### DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the third reading of Bill (181) An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Can my hon. friend say whether this Bill before us is a reprint of the Bill which the House of Commons had before it last session of parliament?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It does not conform altogether, but the whole subject was before the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I refer to section 42.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I could not tell the hon. gentleman whether it was or was not, only in a general way; there was a consolidation last year. They have had another year's experience. I do not know whether that section was in or not.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Could the hon. gentleman say at whose instance this change was made in section 42 from the original Act and the word 'public' stricken out?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I never heard.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Was it made at the instance of any province or at the instance of this government?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I know nothing at all about it. I did not know how the original Act was. Once I took part in the settlement and considered it settled, I thought it was buried forever.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If my hon. friend thought that the school question was dead and that the obsequies had been performed, it seems to me very undesirable that there should have been a resurrection. I find this Bill when introduced into the Commons at the last session of parliament, had the word 'public' in section 42, and was practically a reprint of the existing law. I find that during the session of that parliament—at least I am informed on very reliable authority—that after the Bill had passed its committee stage the Bills were quietly gathered up, and a reprint was made last session leaving out the word 'public.' We have before us this session what I might term a mutilated section. I take exception to the misleading character of the note attached to section 42, and I would direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to it. Hon. members will have in their possession the Bill with the annotations to each section, and this explanatory note follows section 42:

This provision is the same as in the present law, except that the words 'or territory' had been struck out, as the territory referred to has been divided into the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and there are no school lands beyond.