

Mr. FAIR: Because of a number of reasons that have been brought in by different members I raise this question. I have similar cases in mind. The minister has admitted now that several cases have come to his attention. It does seem that there should be some change in this 20-mile limit regulation. I think there should be some way of ensuring that no hardship is done to any person who might otherwise stand to benefit under this Act because of the rigid application of a mileage limitation of this kind. I think that part of the Act should be changed. May I also state that I think some modification should be made to this rigid limitation of six months which a person has to be on the farm. I think one or two slight modifications there will result in a great deal of satisfaction to all concerned. There are certainly some things in the regulations which should be changed.

Mr. SINNOTT: I am going to back the minister up. Anyone who lives in the west knows that farmers move their families into town. That is the general procedure. The object of that is so their children will have a chance to go to school, so that they will be closer to good schools than they would be away out on the farm. We must get down to business here and realize that people must stay on the farms. If they are going to live in towns and have the benefits of town life they will have to come under and be subject to these regulations.

Mr. QUELCH: It is all right for the honourable member to say that, but why doesn't he try to be realistic? He knows it may be impossible in the drought area to get the children to school. There are many cases of farmers who live eight and nine miles from school. How are children in such cases to get to school every day? It is impossible. Farmers who want their children to have an education simply have to move into town. Anyhow he knows quite as well as I do what many of these small towns are like; just a few shacks, very often. And they move there for one reason, and one reason alone—in order to give their children an education. You should be the last one to suggest taking that from them.

This is the type of case which should be taken care of, and I am suggesting that the board should be given discretion to allow the bonus to be paid in such cases.

Mr. WHITMAN: What distance would you suggest?

Mr. QUELCH: I would leave that entirely to the discretion of the board in these drought areas. I know the case of a farmer who lives thirty miles from a school. I do not think any distance should be put in there. Let it remain the way it is, 20 miles; and allow the board discretion to pay it where payment is justified.

Mr. SINNOTT: How are you ever going to get schools in these communities whose people won't stay there?

Mr. QUELCH: Give them discretion to deal fairly with cases in the drought area. You know the restrictions there as well as I do. There are cases where you have farms of 3,000 acres where they are only permitted to graze a very limited herd of cattle. Where you have these 3,000-acre farms you must realize that you will never get enough people in one convenient area to justify a school. In cases like that discretion should be allowed.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: May I give what figures I have here? The province of Saskatchewan is divided into six districts. At least, it was during the period for which I have these figures. It is seven now I think. Those figures will cover about one-sixth of the people who are concerned. The number of farmers paid in full in this particular district, 8,580; and the number who were refused because of distance from their farms was 28. There are 28 people in that district, which is about one-sixth of the area. There is another one here; I think