

men who understand the marketing of eastern wheat. There is not a question in my mind but that the Ontario farmer lost a lot of money in the marketing of his wheat by this particular board, although I will say that if there had been no board, he would, I believe, have got ten cents a bushel less.

Mr. HOMUTH: Who created the board?

Mr. CLARK: The government, of course, and I supported it. If the board had handled and marketed the wheat in an orderly manner, it would have been a real asset.

Mr. HOMUTH: Very bad!

Mr. CLARK: That is right. Therefore I am in favour of a board controlled by this government, and, if you like, in affiliation with the wheat board, but I would urge that those who constitute it should be thoroughly familiar with the marketing of Ontario wheat.

I have had a chat on this matter with the minister since six o'clock. If we are going to take up some of these regulations, I may have something to say about the corn situation.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have a question to ask about the first regulation, dealing with definitions:

"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.

I wondered about that word "and" in the regulation. A number of our farmers still cling to the idea that a fine mulch on land is the best way of preserving moisture, and yet we know perfectly well that a fine mulch encourages soil drifting. I wondered whether the intent was to compel farmers to leave the surface of the soil rough, as they are doing in many places, or to let the grass remain on the surface of the land to prevent drifting. I noticed that word "and", and I thought I should like to get the minister to express an opinion as to whether it had any particular significance in this definition.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, it would probably be more correct to say, "and/or"; that is, to put both words in, because it is intended to deal with either the one case or the other.

Mr. PERLEY: How will this affect strip-farming? In many instances farmers had last year half their land in wheat and the other half summer-fallow, under that system.

Mr. GARDINER: That, of course, would be the reason for using the term, "and/or". It may be done through strip-farming. For the

[Mr. Clark.]

purpose of preventing drifting, one year one strip may be summer-fallowed and the other cropped, and the succeeding year the reverse practice will be followed.

Mr. PERLEY: Would this system, then, not upset that whole arrangement; that is, when they have to reduce by 35 per cent the seeded acreage of last year?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not think so, only to this extent, that they would have to put in coarse grains instead of wheat in some of their strips. They might have difficulty in increasing summer-fallow materially, but they could substitute coarse grains.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: With regard to these regulations, may I call attention to the wording of section 2. It reads in part:

With respect to the number of acres in any farm by which the wheat acreage on such farm in 1941 is less than that of 1940, hereinafter called "wheat acreage reduction", the minister may, after requisite proof has been established, pay—

Certain amounts. I notice that in that particular paragraph the word "may" is used—which, after all, is permissive and not mandatory. A little later, in the proviso of paragraph 2, it reads as follows:

. . . provided that in the case of any farm on which

(a) there was no wheat acreage in 1940 but which had wheat acreage in 1939, the wheat acreage of 1939 or 60 per centum of the cultivated acreage in 1940, whichever is the lesser, may be accepted by the minister as the basis for wheat acreage reduction in 1941.

It may be argued that, as is often the case, "may" is mandatory and not permissive. But regulation No. 3 reads as follows:

A farmer to be eligible for any payment with respect to wheat acreage reduction shall make application not later than May 31, 1941—

And so on. In other words, having interchangeably used "may" and "shall", the only conclusion one can come to is this, that "shall" is mandatory and "may" is permissive. Would the minister give consideration to the alteration of paragraph 2 (a) and also (a) of the proviso, so that it would become obligatory for him, upon conformity on the part of any farmer with the provisions of these regulations, to make the payment as therein stated?

Mr. GARDINER: I raised exactly the same question when the draft of the regulations was brought to my attention, and what I am told is this, that in drafting regulations, in the places where they apply to the minister or to the government, "may" is the term used, and that "may" under these cir-