

have the added advantage under the wheat board act in that they will be delivering their wheat on the basis of last year's acreage. Therefore they have two advantages, and I do not think we want that situation. A man may have shot up his wheat acreage to 85 or 90 per cent of his cultivated area; then this year he proceeds to reduce it to any figure that you like, probably 50 per cent, and the remainder is put in summer-fallow. This man has an added advantage so far as quota deliveries are concerned under the wheat board act. I think the committee would be justified in supporting a regulation which would specify a definite figure; whether this figure should be 60 per cent, or 65 per cent, I do not know. It seems to me that some figure must be arrived at which will provide that the acreage allowance will not start until a man has been reduced to a position where his wheat acreage is equal to 65 per cent of his total cultivated land. I do not know whether you can draft it in any other way.

Mr. NICHOLSON: There is the danger that we shall take some of our best land out of cultivation. The other night the hon. member for Melfort was referred to as being one of the best farmers in the west, a compliment which is well deserved. Suppose he has 100 acres ready for seeding and his average production for the last twenty years has been thirty bushels to the acre. From the 100 acre plot he would be permitted to sell 780 bushels of wheat, which he would produce on twenty-six acres, a very small percentage of the land he has suitable for producing wheat. The best farmers in the west have been summer-fallowing a fairly large percentage of their total land. As the regulations now stand, a real hardship will be worked on these men. I think the regulations should be changed to provide for a percentage of every farm to be in summer-fallow, and the arrangements worked out on that basis.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to give three illustrations which have come to my attention from a farmer in western Canada. He writes:

I have a section (640 acres) of land with 490 acres under cultivation. I made this farm myself from the pioneer days, and now have a tenant who rents it from me on a half crop basis. I supply all the seed, pay all the taxes and half the threshing bill, and half the twine account. The tenant does the work and pays his half share of the threshing and twine bills. Of this 490 acres 40 is seeded to barley, 150 acres are summer-fallowed every year, and 300 is seeded to wheat. If we were to reduce wheat acreage 35 per cent and summer-fallow another 100 acres that would give us each \$200, and work and fuel and wear and tear of machinery would have to be taken out of this. This would leave only 200 acres to share between owner and tenant from a section of land, and from

[Mr. Weir.]

the proceeds of what we are supposed to sell viz: twelve bushels per acre at 51 cents per bushel No. 1 northern at this point, we are to pay taxes, threshing and store accounts, machine bills, repairs and other expenses—and smile. I do not suppose that there is another industry at the present time in Canada that is so poorly treated and so poorly paid.

That was his own personal case. He then goes on to tell about a second farmer:

In the second instance the farmer has about 600 acres under cultivation, and each year summer-fallows 300 acres and crops 300 acres, so he cannot reduce acreage, the result being that he will be summer-fallowing, as usual, 300 acres without being eligible for the \$4 per acre bonus, and will be selling his wheat at exactly 51 cents per bushel at this point, providing he is lucky enough to have the top grade of wheat.

The third case is the contra case, a type of case which I think the minister must deal with more adequately under the regulations. I quote:

In the third instance the farmer has a section of land with well over 500 acres under cultivation, and usually summer-fallows from 150 to 200 acres every year. Last year he did not summer-fallow any land, but cropped every acre with wheat. Now, on last year's acreage, he can reduce 35 per cent and summer-fallow 150 or 200 acres which he would no doubt have done in any case, and so will be eligible for the bonus of \$4 per acre for summer-fallow, and yet in reality he is not reducing acreage at all, because he increased his acreage so much last year.

He then goes on to make this observation:

So, as I understand this policy, the man who in recent years has cropped all his land, and probably has dirty land, will be able to easily reduce wheat acreage and get paid for all the summer-fallow that he does, and the man who has kept up a yearly sequence of summer-fallow will not be paid the bonus for doing his usual amount of summer-fallow, but only on summer-fallow that reduces his wheat acreage from his 1940 total.

I suggest to the minister that this is putting a premium on bad farming and imposing a penalty on good. It ought to be equalized a bit more than it is. I do not know how the minister is going to do it, but he will get my point.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is something to which every western member has given a great deal of thought, and the conclusion I have reached is that it is impossible to help the good farmer. He will, of course, by the very nature of the summer-fallowing grow his quota in 1941 on a less number of acres than will the poor farmer. I agree, however, that this measure will be judged perhaps as much by its inequalities as by any other feature. I think we are all in agreement that some attempt should be made to remove the inequalities which the leader of the opposition has indicated. The average of summer-fallow-