

if they can grow that many bushels of wheat on 40 per cent of last year's acreage, they can deliver all they grow if they go down to that 40 per cent level. The two inducements are there. In the first place the farmer does not have to sow 65 per cent of his acreage, and in the second place for every acre that he takes out of wheat he gets either \$2 or \$4, depending upon what he does with it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I understand the minister's reasoning so far, but does that meet the objections of the people to whom I referred? Does it meet the problem of the farmer who last year summer-fallowed 50 per cent of his land, who started to curtail production because he saw something of this sort coming; and does it meet the objection of the man who did not curtail his production? Take two men, each with 400 acres of land. Last year one of them sowed 300 acres. This year he will sow 200 acres and receive a bonus on the other 100. The other farmer, who put half his land in summer-fallow last year, sows 200 acres this year and does not get anything. In other words, the first farmer, who had not been taking care of his land so far as summer-fallow went, will now be paid for the 100 acres that he must summer-fallow this year. The neighbour, who summer-fallowed just as much land, does not get paid for it, because he also summer-fallowed last year. Has the minister in mind any general principle that might be applied instead of taking 1940 as a basis?

It seems to me he will be letting himself in for endless complaints and a great deal of grief under the present arrangement. Letters come in every day from farmers who say that for years they have summer-fallowed 40 or 50 per cent of their land. But they mention the cases of other men, perhaps on farms owned by mortgage companies or tenant farmers, who have thrown in their crop right up to the side of the road. These men now will reduce their acreage and be paid for it. The other farmers say, "We have reduced our acreage all along, but we are not going to be paid for it now." The general feeling among a great many farmers, particularly on the heavy land, is that using 1940 as a basis is going to work out very unfairly to them, and I wondered whether the minister had thought out any other basis, either an average over a period of years or assuming, as I suggested before, the percentage that normally should be in wheat and applying that percentage to the total acreage of the farm.

Mr. GARDINER: I quite understand the point that the hon. member for Weyburn has brought before the committee. As a matter

of fact, most letters which I have received with regard to this proposal bear on that very point.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the big complaint.

Mr. GARDINER: The criticism is that last year we asked them to reduce acreage. The persons who write in now say that they reduced, but their neighbours did not. They contend that some farmers put all their land into wheat last year and that this year we will estimate the reduction on their full acreage, whereas in other cases it will be based on only 35 per cent of the full acreage. That is a type of criticism we received and it is what we had in mind when we drafted the regulations. The regulations provide:

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,

(b) there was wheat in 1940 on more than 60 per centum of the cultivated acreage and in 1939 on less than 40 per centum of the cultivated acreage, or vice versa, the average of the wheat acreage for 1939 and 1940 may be accepted by the minister.

I have read that over a score of times since it was first written and have satisfied myself that it does not mean exactly what we were trying to make it mean. In the first place, there is a gap between the 40 and 60 per centum, the result being that the regulation would be of no particular good to many who are complaining. The idea in drafting the regulation was to pull down the man who had put his crop up in 1940 as compared with 1939, and pull up the man who had put his crop down in 1940 as compared with 1939. I am quite prepared to admit that this drafting is not as clear as it might be, and I was hoping to get some suggestions from members of the committee as to ways and means to cover the different cases. I think there are one or two other cases which would have to be covered.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would not each case have to be dealt with individually?

Mr. WEIR: There is one case which I do not think is met by these regulations. I know of cases where men have seeded in the neighbourhood of 90 per cent of their farms to wheat. That may be a little extreme, but these people never seeded less than 50 per cent. They would be outside either one of these classifications. You will never get them below 50 per cent, so I do not think these regulations would apply. These same people