

As a matter of fact, last fall they went so far as to say that a man who had joined the army, despite the fact that he had lived on the farm during the whole crop year, should be denied the bonus if his family had moved away from the farm, as they did in most instances. I use that simply as an illustration. The definition of the word "farmer" is very loose and general. I think it is the same definition that is used in the Prairie Farm Assistance Act:

"Farmer" means an owner operator, or tenant operator of a farm.

It seems to me it might be wise to be more specific in the regulations if we are not to have another interpretation that will deprive a man of the benefits to which he is entitled if in the fall he should move away, join the army or go into some other business. He will have done the summer-fallowing or put in the coarse grain, and certainly he ought to be eligible to receive this bonus. But if the same sort of interpretation is given as in the case of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, he will not be eligible if he does not continue to reside on the farm. I should like to see some more precise definition of the word "farmer" as well as of the word "farm".

There is one other point. I have had a number of letters from people suggesting that they are growing durum wheat for coarse grain for feed. I am not a farmer; I know nothing about the practical value of durum wheat used as feed, but the suggestion has been made to me that it should be included among the coarse grains, since many farmers have to use it for feed purposes.

Mr. GARDINER: I am afraid it would be rather difficult to accept the last suggestion. A great many people are growing all sorts of wheat for feed, or at least they are feeding all kinds of wheat, so I am afraid there would be some difficulty in that regard. The other suggestions advanced by the hon. gentleman probably should receive some attention. In any event I am quite prepared to have the definitions of "farm" and "farmer" resubmitted to the draftsman to make sure there can be no misunderstanding in the matter. I should like to point out, however, that under this act the claim for payment may be made at any time after July 1. Under the other act referred to, the claim does not become payable until after December 1. In this case the bonus becomes payable while the man is still operating the farm, so I do not think there would be the same difficulty in this case as in the other.

Mr. TUCKER: With a great deal of what was said by the hon. member for Moose Jaw I am in agreement. I should like to suggest

to the minister very strongly, however, that in drafting these regulations he should not forget the peculiar position that prevails in the northern part of Saskatchewan, where the wheat acreage is not very large and where they are bringing a small additional amount under cultivation each year. It is new and rich land, so they are able to sow practically all of it to wheat for several years after it is brought into cultivation. They have had a great deal of that new country practically all in wheat year after year. I submit that in these cases they should be paid the full amount by which they reduce their wheat acreage, no matter if it is 90 per cent, 95 per cent or 100 per cent. After all, the purpose of this proposal is to encourage some reduction in wheat acreage, and to provide compensation for that reduction. The situation I have mentioned must prevail in many of the newer parts of the west.

I have an idea that this clause was intended to meet the case of a great change in 1941 as compared with 1940. That is, where the man had nothing in wheat in 1939 and everything in wheat in 1940, of course he would be able to collect on the full reduction from 100 per cent. Obviously that would be unfair where there was such a variation from year to year, so I think the purpose of the regulation is sound. As I see it, this section is intended to meet the case of a tremendous variation; but as far as possible we should pay for any reduction from the average acreage sown to wheat on that farm; and if the average acreage is 95 per cent or 100 per cent, because it is new land, then I think we should pay compensation for the full reduction. I suggest to the minister that the amounts should be more than 70 per cent and less than 60 per cent; and in that case only should there be an averaging up. That is, where they had more than 70 per cent in 1940 and less than 60 per cent in 1939, or vice versa, that would show a greater swing than usual because of peculiar conditions. Then it would be fair to strike an average; but with the exception of those cases, I do not see any need of bringing in 1939.

Mr. QUELCH: I should like to refer for a moment to the definition of "summer-fallow", which reads:

"Summer-fallow" means the cultivation of fallow land before August 1, 1941, in such a way as to conserve soil moisture and prevent soil drifting.

That is a very wide definition, and could mean almost anything. I take it that the interpretation of this definition will be left with the local municipality, which should be the body to interpret the meaning of that clause. In certain districts certain methods