

ing in Saskatchewan is roughly 30 per cent of the cultivated land. I would ask the minister whether the suggestion of the hon. member for Macdonald would be acceptable, that in the application of the regulations the compensation of \$4 an acre for the summer-fallow increase in 1941 commence only at the average for 1939 and 1940, or commence only after at least one-third of the cultivated land has been summer-fallowed. Has the minister given any consideration to that suggestion?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, but in giving consideration to it we were compelled to go back to what we had in mind when we started out to get down to 230,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is, we had to say to the persons who have been growing wheat fairly continuously on large acreages: "We will at least start somewhere near the acreage that you were growing." If we did not do that, the margin between what they were growing and where we started to pay would be so great that it would not induce them to cut down their acreage, and they may be the very people who have perhaps been creating the most trouble for us by producing large bushelages from large acreages. It was felt that we could not say: "We will not recognize that amount you have, but get down to say one-third," which in some areas is considered the recognized proportion which should be summer-fallowed. In other areas 50 per cent is thought to be the proper proportion, summer-fallowing 50 per cent this year and then putting it in crop next year, as in the second case which the leader of the opposition cited.

While I am on my feet I may say as regards the first case cited by the leader of the opposition, the one in which a man has a section of land, with 300 acres in wheat, a certain acreage in summer-fallow and a certain acreage in coarse grains, if he desired to increase his summer-fallow by fifty acres—

An hon. MEMBER: Reduce his acreage.

Mr. GARDINER:—he starts at the wrong end. That man reduces his wheat acreage to start with by one-third, let us suppose, as we have suggested that all of them should do in order to meet the conditions of the policy—at least that much. If he takes off one-third of his cultivated acreage and puts it in summer-fallow, that is 100 acres, he gets \$400. If my figuring is correct, when a man does that, whether it is 100 or 300 acres, and gets his quota on the basis of 65 per cent, then in so far as the quota is concerned he gets the advance plus about sixteen cents a bushel, which gives him eighty-six cents a bushel on

the quota that he is allowed. I state that to indicate that it is one cent more than most people have been saying that a man should get on his quota. If he takes \$4 an acre on one-third of his acreage; then takes the quota he is going to be allowed anyway, and adds the money he gets at seventy cents a bushel Fort William to the \$4 an acre, he will receive eighty-six cents a bushel Fort William. If, however, he was allowed only his quota of the 230,000,000 bushels, he would get eighty-five cents. But he will get eighty-six cents a bushel if he puts in his summer-fallowing, and if he puts in coarse grains, he will get 8 cents plus whatever he gets out of his coarse grains.

The second case is one which is half and half. There are two ways of doing the half-and-half job. The ordinary farmer who lives on the farm always does it by farming half of his farm this year. He puts in a crop on half of the farm and summer-fallows the other half. But many of the mortgage companies which have taken possession of large areas of land work it with hired labour, and they summer-fallow the whole of the land this year and crop the whole of the land next year, thus keeping one operation going on all the time. It is the person who does that that we are trying to get at when we say we shall average 1939 and 1940 and make it not more than 60 per cent. We give the persons who do that a little advantage by saying: "We will allow up to 60 per cent, but not more than that."

Mr. TUCKER: I should like to say a word or two about this clause as it is drafted. I can think of companies such as those to which the minister refers who in 1939 had perhaps 60 per cent of the land sowed to wheat and did not get a very good return on that wheat crop because of drought or something like that. Or they might have had 50 per cent sowed to wheat. Then last year, on account of the fact that they figured the land was clean enough to sow to wheat, they might have put it all in wheat, and they could collect on the entire reduction in wheat acreage in 1941 from 1940 because their 1939 crop was more than 50 per cent wheat. There must be many cases like that where people sowed more than 50 per cent to wheat in 1939. Because it was a dry year in some districts in 1939, they sowed more than 60 per cent to wheat in 1940. Under this clause they would not be affected at all, even if they sowed 100 per cent in 1940. For the clause to affect them, they must have sowed less than 40 per cent in 1939. I submit that the way the clause is worded, it is ineffective. I suggest that you put it that if there is in wheat