

Mr. GARDINER: There is not much difficulty in that man qualifying if he desires to do so. He could qualify for two years instead of for one, the provision of the legislation is that if he seeds to grass this year and it is still in grass or clover until July 1, 1942, he gets another \$2. I presume, if he is intending to leave it as a volunteer crop this year, it will probably not be a particularly good crop. I do not think it would do any harm if he would sow a little more clover seed on it; he will draw his \$2 this year and still have it in grass next year, and he can get another \$2 next year.

Mr. LEADER: I have seen a volunteer crop come up thicker than one could possibly sow it. It would mean, if he did not get a crop on that this year, that you are extending this bonus until 1943.

Mr. GARDINER: If he gets that, he is lucky to have such a crop.

Mr. LEADER: If we got an increase in payment and this bonus were left out, we would be happier.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Is the minister going to explain how these various groups will be dealt with? Take the case of a farmer who had 130 acres of wheat last year and 400 acres summer-fallow; he does not give the amount he had in 1939. He has 400 acres, summer-fallowed last year, ready for seeding wheat at this moment. Would the minister assume an amount for 1939 and explain what this man would do?

Mr. GARDINER: I have a man sitting in the gallery listening to this discussion, who is a much better draftsman than I am, and we shall probably spend part of the night trying to work out a regulation which will assist in overcoming the difficulties which have been raised here. I should not like to state definitely at the moment what will be in the regulation; but when the committee meets to-morrow, we hope to have a draft which will cover the different points raised.

Mr. FAIR: I hope the minister has some members of the Department of Justice in the gallery also, because it would be a fine thing if they could get the meaning of the legislation passed here when they draw some of their conclusions or hand down decisions. By clause 1, the word "farmer" means an owner operator or tenant operator of a farm. That could be made much more explicit. Under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act we find—although I do not want to discuss that act now—that a farmer may cover two or three or four distinct units if they use the

same outfit of machinery. I know several cases where two or three farmers are using the same outfit of machinery, but at the same time they are separate farming units; these men are all responsible for their own bills; they are using one outfit of machinery because they cannot each afford their own. That was my case when I started farming.

The case of the residence of a farmer is not stated; I should like to see that put in the regulations. Also in the Prairie Farm Assistance Act we find that, in order to qualify, the farmer must be a resident from May 1 until November 1. But when it comes down to actual residence we find that to be a resident from 1907 until November 7, 1939, is not sufficient in order to qualify for bonus. Last year I drew to the attention of the minister the case of some men in my neighbourhood who had been on a farm since 1907 and left there on November 7, 1939. These men put in their crops, paid their one per cent levy to have the acreage bonus; but because they left there before the bonus was actually distributed they were refused the right to participate. I feel that the minister is not satisfied with this judgment; I personally am not satisfied, and I do not think the committee would be satisfied. These men were refused bonus, I believe the only ones in that township. In November, 1940, they asked me to take the question up with the department for them, which I did. I did not get any satisfaction there, so I took the matter up with the minister and he referred the question back to the Department of Justice. This is the reply that was given:

You ask for further advice in connection with cases where persons who would have been entitled to assistance under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act have, before an award has been made to them in the crop year in question, removed from the crop failure area or the township in which they were carrying on farming. You ask to be advised whether such a person may, nevertheless, be awarded assistance.

If, before an award is made, the claimant ceased to be a farmer or to operate the farm as owner or tenant, then, in my view, he is clearly not entitled to receive assistance.

This, in spite of the fact that the regulations say that the man must be on the land from May 1 to November 1 in that particular year.

Where the farmer removes from the township or crop failure area but continues farming elsewhere in the spring wheat area you suggest that he should be encouraged in making this move because, presumably, he will remove to a better farming district. It may be argued in support of granting him the assistance, notwithstanding his removal, that the expressions "in a township" or "in a (crop failure) area" are there merely as a test of the farmer's need. Their removal from the township or area does not relieve their need.