

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I will not delay the session for that, but I hope the first day of next session we will be gratified with a copy of it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have been humiliated in this matter, because when a charge has been made heretofore against the Bureau, it was found the blame was not laid at the proper quarter.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I kept this until the last. The committee did their duty.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resumed in Committee of the Whole consideration of Bill (181) An Act to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.

(In the Committee.)

On subclause 3 of clause 15,

3. If the minister is satisfied that an entry for a homestead has been obtained through personation he shall cancel the entry, and the person so obtaining entry shall not be eligible to obtain another entry, unless the minister declares otherwise.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—There ought to be some punishment for fraud of this character.

Hon. Mr. TALBOT—The punishment that he is not eligible for another entry is severe.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Not severe enough, because it has been found in the past that people had blanketed the whole country by fraudulent means, in order to sell lands to settlers.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I propose to add as subclause 9, a provision for punishing any one guilty of such an offence.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—If a person is guilty of personation, the minister should not have the option of letting him make another entry.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There may be reasons that would justify him.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Why should the minister have the power?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—In an office of that kind, you have to invest the head of it with a good deal of discretion, there are so many cases for which it could not provide. I had some experience of that when I was Minister of Crown Lands.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I do not think that discretion should be left to the minister. If a man has been found guilty of a fraud, why should it be optional with the minister to condone it if he thinks proper and let him make another entry? It might lead to favouritism, and a minister should not be placed in that position.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—In addition to that, you propose making it an indictable offence. It is tantamount to say that the minister may condone or compromise an indictable offence.

Hon. Mr. TALBOT—It does not refer to the same offence as the one for which the hon. Secretary of State intends to make provision.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The minister states that it is to cover the case of personation. I would suggest to strike out the words 'unless the minister declares otherwise.'

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I think it is perfectly safe in the hands of the present minister anyway.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—That is no reply. I move to strike out the words 'unless the minister declares otherwise.'

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not feel inclined to accept the proposition, because we cannot at the moment judge of those things. There may be extenuating circumstances or there may be a doubt about the personation.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—There can be no doubt about it, because the clause provides for the commission of the crime. It is not merely attempting, but it is a case in which the offender has deliberately secured the entry by fraud.

Hon. Mr. TALBOT—Suppose a man with a wife and large family made an entry