

office. It has been very confusing, and difficult to follow through. I happen to know a superintendent who was working under it and he admitted it was confusing, and that the treasury board also were confused—and I quite agree. Many payments on grass have been withheld because this superintendent did not know whether the same interpretation should hold for grass as for rye, and when he gave orders the treasury board refused to make the payment.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, that is one of the reasons why we are simplifying it this year. There has been a great deal of discussion and some misunderstanding on the part of inspectors and superintendents. I have had them all in the office at Regina on two or three occasions myself and tried to explain the matter and I found out later that it was not fully understood. There was an additional complication in that the act said "sown to rye in 1942," and those of us who put that measure through the house last year thought it did not matter when it was actually seeded as long as it was in rye in 1942 and replaced wheat. But when it got before the Department of Justice that was not the interpretation given, and we have to have this amendment to make the payment. Payments have not been made up to date except those that went through on the interpretation of the old regulations which had rye defined as coarse grain. In this bill it is not defined as coarse grain. Some payments did go through on the basis on which they should be paid before this amendment was made, but payments were stopped because it was realized that the wording of the bill did not authorize payment, and payment will be held up until this bill goes through.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): In the future everyone will be paid on the basis of \$2 an acre on the reduction now over the 1940 period, irrespective of whether it is grass or rye? I can assure this committee that a great many people who seeded rye are going to be disappointed. It may be no one's fault but this has been very confusing. Some have been paid on the basis that I have set forth, and others have been held up. Certainly many people seeded rye this fall expecting to be paid for that rye plus another \$2 an acre for reduction for coarse grains next year. In other words, where they counted on receiving \$4 an acre for wheat acreage reduction they will be paid only \$2.

Mr. GARDINER: They could not get the next payment unless they seeded again this fall.

Mr. WRIGHT: Will a man who has bought or rented land this year on which there was no wheat in 1940, be able to get any bonus in respect of that land?

Mr. GARDINER: There are two provisions that may make it possible for him to obtain payment. If the land was out of wheat in 1940 and there was wheat on it in 1939, then he goes back to 1939. If it was new land that was broken in 1940, there is the provision that eighty per cent of the breaking is estimated as wheat in 1940, and any reduction from that is allowed.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The minister gave the amount of \$34,000,000 a short time ago as the amount paid on the 1941 crop year. Has he any figures for the last crop year? Could he give the total in each province and the total number of individual bonuses paid?

Mr. GARDINER: I have the figures here, but they are not complete because some payments are still to be made. This is as of March 23, 1943. The payments were:

Saskatchewan	\$ 9,324,804
Alberta	5,090,882
Manitoba	2,953,814
	\$17,369,500

There is an estimate that when the final payments are made they will total \$18,704,218. The greater part of that reduction as compared with the previous year is because of the cutting down of the amount of summer-fallow at \$4 an acre. In 1942 it is \$2 an acre. The other part of the reduction is owing to the fact that we paid on probably more than a million acres of reduction as between 1940 and 1941 which did not actually take place as the basic acreage was an average between two years, in many cases.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Would the minister give the number of individual bonuses paid for the 1942 crop year?

Mr. GARDINER: I am afraid I have not the total of the number of payments made this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It was some 178,000 the year before?

Mr. GARDINER: It was 178,000 in the previous year. I imagine it will be about the same this year, perhaps a few more.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Has the minister any figures on the actual reduction of wheat acreage? Last year was down from 1941, was it not?

Mr. GARDINER: The estimate is that it was something over one million acres more