

the same time, I do not think they should be allowed to do something which does not conform to the purpose of the Act; namely, to encourage people to stay on the land and to live on the land.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well, Mr. Gardiner, I know of two farmers in British Columbia. They were both tenant farmers and they were both forced to get off the land in September; and they both had crop failures. One of them was paid and the other was not. They were both completely burned out. Why would that be?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There must be some special reason which I have not before me.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is a particular case. They were two families from the same district. One gets the payment and the other does not. How do you explain that? Would a case of that kind be dealt with by the board, or would that have to be referred to council? Who is the board anyway?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, there is a board of three. The chairman of the board is at present the Dean of Agriculture, in the College of Agriculture at Winnipeg. He was previously in the agricultural college at Saskatoon. He is chairman of the board. Another member of the board is Mr. Holmes, of Saskatoon; and Mr. Stevenson is the third member and secretary of the board. They are the people who are administering this.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Why did they allow the one and turn the other down?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, I don't know the basis on which their action was taken in those particular cases, of course. I can tell you this, however, that they do have a report from the inspector with regard to every case; and where necessary they send the inspector back to get a further report. They make their decisions on the basis of all the facts which are before them. I cannot tell you what they do in individual cases, except for those which I happen to refer to the board personally and on which I receive their explanation and reply as to what has been done. From my personal knowledge I feel obliged to say that in 99 cases out of 100 I have to admit that there is no question about the decisions made. There is the unusual case in which there is some question, and then they discuss the facts before the board and if necessary make a further inspection before reconsidering such a case. I do not know the facts in the cases to which you refer, but I do know that there must have been some good reason for one man getting paid and the other being refused unless as occasionally happens a mistake was made in making payment in one case.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: But in this case they had no option; they had to get off the land.

Mr. ARGUE: I would like to deal with these regulations, not only the one relating to the farmer being not more than 20 miles away from the land, but also the one which provides that he may have no other occupation at all. I have in mind a number of cases at home where the farm happens to be small and in a dry area. These people have to go to town and they have to have some sort of a secondary occupation, such as working in a garage, or teaching, or in a local mill. Their main occupation is farming. Their farms may be only two or three miles from town. According to the regulations as they stand, and as they are administered by the board, they would not be eligible to receive the bonus. That is the situation which I think should be corrected.

Mr. CARDIFF: I would like to answer that question, Mr. Chairman; if we don't get a crop we get no consideration in here at all.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well what it all adds up to, Mr. Chairman, is this, that out in British Columbia we are carrying the Saskatchewan farmers. I suppose that applies to the whole of Canada outside the prairie provinces.