

has 10 bushels of No. 6 wheat or feed wheat he should be entitled to come in under the Act because the return is less than he would have received or that farmers are receiving who have that return.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: What would you do with a farmer whose pigs take scurvy or whose cattle take black leg, and all that kind of thing?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is a different proposition entirely. This is the Prairie Farm Assistance Act to which we are contributing. We have contributed over the years. As far as the township I am in is concerned I do not think we will ever come under the Act. I hope not. We do not object to paying, but there are marginal areas around the area I represent where they are subject to frost and subject to floods. They are really in need of some assistance just as much as though they were living right in the centre of the drought area. They are contributing to the Act but it is very seldom they can ever get anything out of it because of the way in which the regulations and the Act are drawn. To be fair I really think there should be some leeway given with regard to that. It should be worked on the basis of cash returns rather than paying it on a straight bushel basis because in these areas if they break a new piece of land it is put in wheat. The best land is put in wheat. They try to get as much return as they can from their land with the result that, the basis on which the Act is operated being wheat, they naturally put themselves out of the Act. If they have a high piece of land they can get it in early and they sow it in wheat. Maybe there is only a small portion of the farm that is like that, and a large part of their farm is low land and they sow it in oats and barley. As a result of that they have a greater average yield of wheat in proportion to coarse grains, and it does operate unfairly as far as they are concerned. If in those areas they used coarse grains as the basis of the Act they would come in, but because the Act uses wheat as a basis for determining whether or not they come under the Act, and the highest land is put in wheat, they just do not come under the Act although they contribute to it over the years. I think some consideration should be given to those areas.

Mr. BENTLEY: I wonder if the minister would put into plain language the exact meaning of subsection 4 of section 3, the kind of language he uses to speak to the farmers in the school house.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It deals with that fellow somebody was talking about a while ago. That is the man farming one piece away from the other. The land is divided proportionately as between the two places in order to take care of what he is entitled to. It is an unfortunate thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. HARRIS: There is just one remark that I want to make. It has to do with the second line of subsection (3). In the definition of farmer above we have gone away from the old definition which said that a farmer is one who is resident from May first to December first. This is an effort, I take it, to extend the Act, and the definition is this, "to each person who was a farmer continuously from the first day of May to the first day of November—." The use of the word "continuously" seems to be a way which would cut down all these benefits which we have been discussing earlier in this meeting.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: According to this, it means "each person who was a farmer continuously from the first day of May to the first day of November in such year."

Mr. HARRIS: If I were to administer the Act I would be stumped by the word "continuously;" and I would have thought that I would have to come back to the old definition we had this morning—the case of a man moving off in July and August to earn some money.