

costs of oil and repairs and so on and see \$133 go, it may be, to the absentee landlord, even though the \$133 would be a good deal less than the rental he would normally receive with twenty bushels to the acre at fifty cents a bushel. While a hardship would be worked on some people, it is more important that the farmer actually working the land should have enough to keep himself and family for this temporary period. I support the suggestion of the hon. member for Weyburn, that the farmer who does the work should be entitled to keep the \$400.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Under regulation 5, paragraph (b), there is going to be an even more complicated proposition. The vendor or mortgagee is to get one-third of whatever interest he has in the farm. If he has a one-third interest in the farm, he gets one-third of one-third. Solomon trying to divide the child between two women had an easy task compared with what the Minister of Agriculture will have. He will have almost innumerable cases as between two contracting parties each trying to establish his share of the bonus. The Minister of Agriculture will have to become a referee in thousands of cases.

Mr. GARDINER: No; it is settled in accordance with these regulations.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It will be a matter of deciding what interest each has. If a mortgagee has an interest in a quarter-section and the question arises how much of the land taken out of wheat production is actually in the quarter-section in which the vendor has an interest—

Mr. GARDINER: If he is farming three quarter-sections and the mortgage is on one quarter, no mortgage on the half-section, and there was 300 acres of wheat last year and it is reduced this year by 150, then the amount there would be fifty acres per quarter-section; or the reduction of 150 acres is on the basis of one-third of one-third going to the mortgagee and the remainder to the man farming the land.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The regulations do not say that. Suppose the farmer were to claim that the 150 acres were all on his half-section—

Mr. GARDINER: He cannot.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): —and the bonus was on the land in which he is interested, then the minister would have to be referee. The hon. member for Swift Current hit the nail on the head; the task of the minister under these regulations is to pay the bonus. The relation between the contracting

parties is something for the provincial government, and the minister would be wise to wipe his hands of the grief in which he will be involved if he tries to carry out the implications of these two paragraphs.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There is a good deal of merit in the suggestions offered by the hon. member for Weyburn and the hon. member for Swift Current. In some localities most of the tenant's share will be taken up in connection with the labour required, and he will not get his just portion. That will not be so in every instance, but it will be so in many. It seems to me that if this payment were made direct to the operator, the division could then be made under contract between the landlord and the tenant, which I think would avoid a great deal of trouble for everyone concerned.

To come now to the question of what constitutes summer-fallow, a question which has been asked by many hon. gentlemen this evening, in many districts of the west we have had innovations or new systems introduced in the last few years in connection with what we now call summer-fallowing. I am wondering whether the superintendents of the experimental farms in the various areas might not more or less decide what constitutes proper summer-fallowing, because it varies in many districts.

Mr. GARDINER: I have already stated that under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act the superintendents of the experimental farms in the different areas are consulted; and of course the method of summer-fallowing adopted is very often that which has been advocated by the superintendent of the farm. Of course these gentlemen will be consulted with regard to these matters.

Mr. CHURCH: This appropriation of \$35,000,000 for supplementary estimates, should not be passed until it is considered by the agriculture committee. The *Toronto Globe and Mail* has some things to say this morning about the Canadian council of agriculture, whose representatives have been around here for the last week urging these and other measures for the protection of this industry. These gentlemen are now advocating the most advanced form of protection for agriculture. In this house I have always supported a proper national policy for the grain growers of Canada; that is, the men who actually grow the grain. The premiers of the three prairie provinces, and the ministers of agriculture in this house in the past since I have been here, were consistent free traders before the war, as far as this great industry is concerned. I have taken a