

a few moments ago. Of course, if we get reports from there that cattle are arriving in the United States which are not in accordance with the certification, then we may give a warning. If it is not a serious case or if it is not a repeat of something that has happened before, we may give a warning. But if there is any repeating of the offence, of course prosecution will be started.

Mr. BRYCE: Is that the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WRIGHT: I should like to find out a little more about this matter of prosecution. It would be mostly a matter of cases of United States buyers who are here and pick up cattle, and who are endeavouring to get them across, in which the offences would occur; or at least I would suppose it would be in their case that most of the offences would occur. What jurisdiction has the minister to prosecute in those cases where the offences may have been committed by someone outside the country?

Mr. GARDINER: The cases I know of are not cases of United States buyers. They are cases of Canadian sellers; that is, they are buyers from the farmers who sell into the United States. The conspiracy is, in some instances, between the veterinarian who gives the certificate and the buyer who is buying the cattle; and in other instances, it will be as between the veterinarian and the owner of the cattle who wants them cleared, to be shipped to the United States.

Section agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ACT

AREAS SURVEYED AS SETTLEMENT OR RIVER LOTS— LAND IN ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE TOWNSHIPS

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, 1939, to provide that the act may apply to areas surveyed as settlement or river lots, to provide also that where a farmer has land in an eligible township and land in an ineligible township payment may be made to him to the full amount of his eligible land, and for the purpose of clarifying certain provisions of the act.

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the minister give an explanation of just what are the implications of this resolution?

Mr. GARDINER: Hon. members who come from the area along the Red river, and those who come from areas in Saskatchewan along the Saskatchewan river, will understand that the first settlers in those areas settled on the system of land ownership which prevailed at that time in the province of Quebec; that is, they have river lots which ran back from the river. The river was then the means of transportation as between these various farms, and they have a system of river lots that run from the river back into the country. Under this resolution we provide that payment shall be paid on the basis of a township; and the township, as we understand it and as it is defined in the act, is the local survey unit six miles square. No provision was made in the original act for taking care of these river lots. It has become necessary, as a result of experiences during the last year, to make such provision. These lots are now in areas which should draw under this act, and there is no special provision for them. So this gives us authority, under the regulations, to define, within the district in which the river lots are, an area which bears a reasonable relationship to the six miles square that prevails in other sections of the three western provinces.

The other matter which is mentioned in the resolution specifically has to do with an amendment we made last year. Hon. members will recall that when I brought in the legislation last year I suggested that no material change was being made in the principle underlying the payments which were to be made. But after we started to administer the act, we found that in one of the sections we had provided something which did make a material change. Where a farmer was on land in two different townships, and where one piece of land was removed from the other by four or five, or maybe ten miles, part of the land would be in a district where there was an average crop of less than eight bushels to the acre, while the other would be in a district where the average would be perhaps more than eight bushels, which meant that the one piece of land would come under the act while the other would not. Last year we provided, I think inadvertently—I did not understand at the time that this change would be made, and certainly it was not explained to other hon. members—that this land would be dealt with proportionately, as between the two areas, as though it were one farm. It has been found that this does not deal fairly with farmers in the different areas, and we are simply asking to have the act put back as it was before. There will be no change now from the provision which was in effect prior to last year,