

farmer marketing wheat, and thereafter an ascending quota dependent upon the crop and the yield in the district adjacent to the shipping point. I think it is admitted that in areas where the crop yield is light, the farmers will be under the necessity of marketing more grain than the initial quota would provide. Roughly speaking, a five-bushel quota would provide in the gross \$2.50, and I would suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he consider that until the quotas reach fifteen bushels an acre, it be maintained equally throughout the whole wheat-growing area. That would give to each farmer, as storage space permitted, the right to deliver on a basis of equality, regardless of yield per acre, a number of bushels amounting to fifteen an acre. That might mean seeking the cooperation of the railways to move grain more quickly out of the low yield districts than out of the high yield districts, but I suggest to the minister that the \$7.50 which fifteen bushels would provide is a sum absolutely necessary for every farmer to have in order to take care of the costs incurred by his being in the business of farming, and to take care of his immediate necessities. I do not think that would work any hardship. Thereafter the gradation of quotas could be applied. We must keep in mind that by the very fact that a farmer has a generous yield per acre, he is in a better position to finance his requirements and take care of his immediate household needs than a farmer with a very low yield in the drought-stricken area. I suggest that the minister give this matter due consideration in considering the system of quotas.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): It is impossible to draft regulations or introduce legislation on the subject of wheat which will fit the particular circumstances of each of the three hundred thousand farmers in western Canada. There will be suggestions made in this discussion similar to the ones made by the hon. member for Swift Current, and all I can say at the moment is that they will be taken under advisement and discussed with the wheat board.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is it not true that under the 230,000,000 bushels limitation it would be impossible to accept fifteen bushels an acre from three-quarters of the wheat acreage?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Quite impossible.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know that, but as the quotas are lifted and as storage space permits, an extra number over and above the five bushels could be allowed until a quota of fifteen bushels was reached.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The small farmer with fifty acres in wheat and twenty bushels to the acre has a cash crop of about \$500. He may have twenty-five acres of summer-fallow and twenty-five acres of coarse grains, but he depends on wheat for his cash crop. This is what he must have to pay his taxes, his costs of growing grain so far as he can, his machinery costs, his payments on the land, necessary clothing and medical attention. Out in the west the municipalities often resort to seizure to get their taxes in, and if the fifty acres of wheat is cut down to thirty-four acres, and the farmer is allowed to deliver, as he will be under the quota, only about twelve bushels an acre, he will have a cash income of about \$300. A cash income of \$300 means that he cannot carry on. I would therefore urge that serious consideration be given to the suggestion that no compulsory action be taken against the man who has less than 800 or 1,000 bushels to deliver, because, if he cannot deliver that much, he is in tragic circumstances.

The minister said the other night that the best place to store the wheat was in the land in form of summer-fallow, but I want to tell him this, that if the farmer stores wheat in the form of summer-fallow, then under existing circumstances he is likely storing it for someone else. Those farmers have had no proper protection for years. There is nothing to stop the mortgage holders from seizing the land. I urge the government to use the War Measures Act to institute at least a moratorium against foreclosures for the duration of the war. Otherwise their homes are going to be taken away from the farmers and the people left on them will be share-croppers. That will be the ruination of a large portion of western Canada.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us last November that the government was taking steps to see that the farmers did not bear an unfair share of the burden of this war. But these farmers are going to be compelled to yield their land and their homes and everything they have worked for if this legislation goes through. I appeal, therefore, to the administration seriously to consider the consequences of this legislation. It means the ruination of these people. I can see no other way out. Somebody has referred to the farmers as the first casualties in this war. The administration should do something to restore their morale instead of driving them deeper into despair. Many of these people have given their sons, and many of them have gone themselves to fight to save Canada. When the boys return and find their