

members of parliament expect this bonus? I think we should have it understood. I do not care about clause 6. I will try to farm in a constructive and sound way, and I had all my arrangements made and contracted for on February 12, before this was thought of, but this matter is something which should be definitely settled.

Mr. GARDINER: I myself have sought legal advice on the question and I have had opinions both ways. I will try to get an opinion of the Department of Justice some time to-morrow if I can, and give whatever advice I receive.

Mr. LEADER: I wish to get settled in my own mind the basis of payment on either the 1940 or 1939 crop. I agree with the hon. member for Moose Jaw that we cannot expect to draft legislation that will fit the case of every farmer in the west or even in Manitoba. It is impossible. What we shall have to do is to take the average, what we think will really fit the majority of cases. The hon. member for Moose Jaw expressed the idea that was running through my own mind. What we want is a basis of paying the bonus on 65 per cent of the 1940 wheat acreage or, as the case may be, 1939 wheat acreage. The fairest way would be to take the average of the wheat acreage for the two years, 1939 and 1940, and settle at 65 per cent of this average. Never mind the 30 per cent, or 40 per cent, or 60 per cent, but take the two years together and settle on the basis of the average.

Mr. WEIR: Does the hon. member know how much he had in 1939?

Mr. LEADER: Most people do.

Mr. GARDINER: We have the forms, but they are not yet printed because they have not yet been finally approved. I spent a part of Saturday going over the rough drafts which were made for me. We are going over the return with regard to the 1939 crop and also similar answers with regard to the 1940 crop, so that on every application made before May 31 we shall have the farmer's statement of what he grew in 1939 and what he grew in 1940, or what he seeded to wheat, and so on, and what he intends to do in 1941. We shall have all on one form so that we shall have a statement of what the farmer says he did; and then we have 75 per cent—to be safe I will say 65 per cent, but I think I may say 75 per cent—of all the farms now listed for the two years under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. For two years the farmers have given statements. We have checked on many of the farms to find what the acreage

[Mr. Perley.]

was in different crops, and these statements can be compared with the statement made this year, so that we do not expect any difficulty in getting information with regard to 1939 and 1940. The matter of averaging, therefore, will not be difficult.

I take it from the discussion that there are at least five classes about whom members are concerned. First, there is the man who had all his acreage in wheat in 1940. It is not thought that he should be permitted to collect on his total acreage. Something should be done to reduce that acreage. If it were averaged between 1939 and 1940, if he put all in one year and had none the next year, the average would be 50 per cent. Then there is the man who had no wheat in 1940. Third, there is the man who raised his average acreage in 1940; that is, he raised the acreage over 1939. Then there is the man who lowered his acreage in 1940 under 1939, and there is the man who has broken up new land. This is the first year he will grow a crop, and there will probably have to be some regulation with regard to his case.

Mr. HOWDEN: What about the man whose first year was last year?

Mr. GARDINER: The general practice in the west has been to grow all of the breaking you can into wheat, with a small acreage for feed grain, and then the second year to back-set that land and sow it all to wheat again. Summer-fallowing is not started until at least the third year of farming. There may be cases in 1939 and 1940. But where a man has grown one crop, it is not so difficult; that is, his 1940 crop. If, however, he has not grown a crop at all; if last year was his first year and he broke the land up, we shall have to assume that he had 65 or 70 per cent or some such figure last year to make it apply. I do not know whether there is any other case.

Mr. LEADER: There is the case where farmers have a volunteer crop of sweet clover—and quite a number have. It is seed that had been sown two or three years before, but owing to the dry weather it had not germinated. It might start next spring and the man might see it coming up and decide not to put in wheat but to let the land grow sweet clover. He should be allowed the clover bonus on that sort of crop. He is taking his land out of production and leaving it for fodder. It would be allowed him anyway if he seeded it that spring with his seeder, but because he was fortunate enough to have a volunteer crop and did not have to sow, he should not be penalized. This may be an isolated case, but it might happen.