

Prairie Farm Assistance Act

Mr. Gardiner: You would find it difficult to spread a little bit of wheat over a whole township and have it amount to more than eight bushels to the acre. It does not work out that way. I do not think you will have any great difficulty about that.

My hon. friend has repeated what was said in the committee, namely, that this government is expected to do something to help that district. They have said they are going to give financial grants to the province. Then they have said to the province, "You will have to deal with the municipalities and the municipalities will have to deal with the farmers." What I said in the committee was that if this act does come into effect down in that area I believe the first thing the committee will do will be to deduct anything the farmer gets under this act, when they are making a general distribution. I think that would be the sensible thing to do. If we are to have a special grant to take care of that area, there is no reason why this act should apply at all. If it did apply, it would apply only up to a certain point, and anything beyond that would be applied from another source.

Mr. Charlton: What appears on the order paper under item No. 5 is:

House in committee on Bill No. 209, an act to amend the *Prairie Farm Assistance Act, 1939* (as amended).

Those of us who were members of the agriculture committee know what is in the amendment, but for the benefit of those who were not I would suggest the minister have the bill reprinted.

Mr. Gardiner: The bill has been printed for three weeks, and we do not usually reprint it to take care of amendments. I shall read the amendment to subsection (c) which is the provision that has been discussed up to the moment. It reads as follows:

(c) with respect to lands not sold or granted, or not agreed to be sold or granted, by His Majesty prior to the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and forty, and for the purposes of this section such lands shall not be included in computing the cultivated land of a farmer, and the grain grown thereon shall not be included in computing the average yield in a township, but this paragraph does not apply to

- (i) lands disposed of to a settler or veteran under the *Soldier Settlement Act* or the *Veterans Land Act, 1942*,
- (ii) lands in a special area in Alberta as constituted by or under the *Special Areas Act, 1939*, of Alberta,
- (iii) lands approved by the board and held by a co-operative farm association,
- (iv) school lands, or
- (v) lands with respect to which an agreement has been entered into between the government of Canada and the government of a province under the *Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act*.

[Mr. Argue.]

The meaning of that section, for the benefit of those who were not in the committee, is as follows: In the provision which says that the act is not to apply to certain land, there is (a), (b) and now (c), which is this one. It says the act does not apply with respect to land not sold or granted or not agreed to be sold or granted, and that means lands that were not sold to someone outright or were not homesteaded; that is really the meaning of it. It does not apply to those lands if that had not taken place prior to December 31, 1940.

Then the latter part of subsection (c) says the first part of subsection (c) does not apply to certain lands within a group, such as lands disposed of to a settler or veteran under the *Soldier Settlement Act* or the *Veterans Land Act* in 1942. Those lands come back in under the act. Lands in special areas in Alberta, as constituted by or under the *Special Areas Act* of 1939, come under the act. Then there are lands approved by the board and held by a co-operative farm association—that covers the land to which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was referring a few moments ago, which is in the old Matador ranch. That land is now under a co-operative farm association, and by virtue of this amendment it would be under the act.

The member for Assiniboia has brought up the question of school land and Hudson's Bay land. He did not mention the school land so often today, so I presume the explanation given on that has satisfied him that it is an exceptional case. The school lands are lands that were set up to be disposed of by auction, and the funds so obtained put into the school fund. We are not interfering with those lands. We are assuming that the old provisions made for the school fund are still operative, and still should be operative. We are not doing anything about those.

Then there are the lands with respect to which agreement has been entered into between the government of Canada and the government of the provinces under the *Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act*. We sit down with the government of Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba, and say that certain lands which were not disposed of prior to December, 1940, we would like to use to set up a pasture organization. The province says that is all right, so we make an agreement to move the men off the area we want to put into pasture and onto a piece of land which is owned by the province and that land is eligible for payment under the *Prairie Farm Assistance Act*. The discussions the other day had to do with the lands up in the north-eastern section of Saskatchewan which are still owned by the provincial government, because the timber has never been taken off