

produce until 1943, and rye which was sown in 1941 did not produce until 1942. The same is true of all grasses. The biennial plants are in the same classification as rye and the perennial plants would all have been seeded previous to the year in which they produced. This bill provides that one of the things that must be shown in order to draw the second payment is that the wheat acreage reduction has been followed from one year into another. That is, at least whatever wheat acreage reduction prevailed in 1942 must prevail in 1943 in order to obtain the entire second payment in 1943. I might say that that had to be done before, but it was not definitely stated in the act and in some cases mistakes have been made in making payments.

The other stipulation in the bill is to provide for payment in 1943 for wheat acreage reduction. In making this provision it is necessary to amend the act of 1942 by changing dates here and there, and it is also necessary to state the basis upon which payment in 1943 is to be made. We have had some difficulty in connection with the administration of the act because of our efforts in the past to be fair to everyone. In trying to be fair to the small percentage, sometimes we have been compelled by the provisions of the act to be more or less unfair to the greater number. This year we are trying to simplify the payments as much as we can. We are simply stating that we are going to pay \$2 per acre on all acreage that has been reduced as between 1940 and 1943. To illustrate, if a man had 100 acres in wheat in 1940 and he has 50 acres in 1943, he would be entitled to a payment of \$2 per acre on the reduced acreage.

We are not asking him to sow either coarse grains or rye or grass or to summer-fallow or do anything in particular with it, but if he abandons the land he will not be paid. In other words he can sow it to any crop he chooses other than wheat, or he can summer-fallow it. In that case he will be paid \$2 per acre for the number of acres by which he reduces his acreage in 1943 as compared with 1940.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): He must do something with it.

Mr. GARDINER: He must do something with it. There is no provision for a second payment on rye or grass in 1944. This means that from now on the payment will be \$2 per acre on rye or grass. In explanation of this I may say that when we first brought down this measure in the form of regulations it was stated clearly to the house that it was not anticipated that the policy would be

followed for more than one year. Believing that it would not be continued over a term of years was our chief reason for bringing it down in the form of regulations rather than as a bill. However, so many complications have entered into the calculation of the payments in relation to grass and rye that it would be most difficult to continue on from year to year if this measure is to be necessary for the duration of the war, say for another two or three years. Therefore we are providing for a payment of \$2 per acre for every acre that is taken out of wheat but which is still continued in cultivation.

Those are the main features of the bill. There is one other matter some hon. members will be interested in. We are stating that in future a landlord will have to make application for payment under the act before June 30 and that in order to have the right to apply for payment he must have a signed statement from the operator of the land to the effect that the operator recognizes a certain individual or company as the landlord.

Mr. SENN: The minister was speaking about grasses. I am not certain whether in the western provinces you grow perennial grasses. If so, do I understand that each year the land is under grass they will be paid \$2 an acre, or just for the year that it is seeded and the following year when it comes into production? That is one question I would like answered, for my own information.

In the estimates there is a reduction of some \$23,000,000 in the vote, No. 31, for this very purpose. Will further estimates have to be brought down to cover operations for this year?

Perhaps the minister will bear with me while I ask a third question. Could he tell us how much of that \$35,000,000 in respect of that ten million acres was expended in 1941, and what amount in 1942; and how it was divided—so much, I understand, into summer-fallow, so much into rye, so much into coarse grains, so much in grasses. Could he give us any indication of the acreage average of these different products?

Mr. GARDINER: To answer first the question with regard to the estimates, I will point out that each year it has been the custom in connection with this legislation to bring down a supplementary. The provision in the estimates as we now have them is only for the amount which would still have to be paid out after March 31, 1943, on the liability