

small amount of money paid for summer-fallow. Almost all the farmers I know—there are a few exceptions—summer-fallowed last year. In some cases they summer-fallowed their whole acreage. It is not likely that that land will be summer-fallowed a second year in succession.

Then there is this to be remembered—and perhaps it will relieve the minds of honourable senators from Eastern Canada: on every load of wheat that is sold there is a deduction of one per cent; so that in a sense the farmers of Western Canada are contributing to the fund for the benefit of their neighbours.

One of the causes responsible for discontinuance of the growing of flax was the importation of cheap vegetable oils and linseed into this country. The price became so low that Western farmers could not grow flax at a profit. I do not hesitate to say that this Government and this country will be amazed at the amount of flax that will be grown if seed can be secured. I have grown flax myself, and I know it is not so difficult. It is a crop that you can combine not only any time in the fall, but even in the summer after the seed has stood out all winter.

But you could not produce flax at 60 cents. I grew it and sold it at 90 cents a bushel. That was not worth while, but if I had got \$2.25 it would have meant a nice profit. I know many Western farmers who have made good money growing flax and wheat together. They have it sent to the head of the lakes and separated, a practice which is carried out in the Dakotas to a very large extent. They claim it is much easier to handle a wheat crop with a certain amount of flax, and also that in this way they get more per acre than it is possible to get by growing either crop separately.

Hon. Mr. MARSHALL: The two bonuses will bring it up to about \$2.50 a bushel.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It is a very good price. I am not sure about the quantity of flax available for seed, but I think the country will be agreeably surprised by the large production of flax next year.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: I should like to ask a question of the honourable senator from Peel (Hon. Mr. Marshall). Do I understand he wants these Bills sent to different committees? I would suggest to him that they all are largely financial measures; there is not much principle involved in them. In round figures, the reduction in wheat acreage last year from the acreage of 1940 was ten million acres. In 1940 there were about 27 million acres in wheat, and last year this was reduced to about 17 million acres. There is the Bill

providing for a price of 90 cents, which is a money measure. The Prairie Farm Assistance Bill is another money measure. And this Bill now before us is also a money measure. So I would suggest that this Bill should be sent to the same committee as the other two Bills. They all are concerned with the one problem.

Hon. Mr. MARSHALL: Will the honourable gentlemen excuse me a minute? Why not send the Bills to a joint meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee and the Agriculture Committee?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I do not care where they are sent, so long as they all go to the same place.

Hon. Mr. MARSHALL: They should be dealt with by a large committee. Of course, every member of the Senate is entitled to attend the meetings of any committee, whether or not he is a member of it. I am quite willing to move that these Bills be sent to a joint meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee and the Agriculture Committee.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I am agreeable.

However, I should like to spend a moment or two in painting if I can—and I am not sure that I can—a picture of this problem as we of the West see it. I do not want Eastern Canada to feel that in this measure we of the West are asking for something, in the form of a bonus, which we are able to get simply because we holler louder than somebody else; for that is not true. The world-wide wheat problem started to develop in 1927 or 1928, at which time the German and Italian Governments set a very high duty on wheat in order to induce their farmers to grow this grain, so that when the war which those Governments anticipated did come they would not be faced with conditions such as followed the world war of 1914-1918 and brought their peoples to starvation. That was the beginning of Canada's difficulties in disposing of wheat and other grain products. I will not follow the wheat situation through the next ten years, because all honourable members are familiar with the history of that. Now we come to a time when shipping is added to our difficulties. On the 31st of July last year we had on hand, I think, about 450 million bushels of wheat. The honourable member for Thunder Bay (Hon. Mr. Paterson) can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe the figure is fairly accurate. I expect that this year the carry-over will not be more than 400 million bushels; it may not be so much. Last year the Government agreed to