Mr. ROSS (Souris): On the rye they seeded in 1941?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes. Their land was out of wheat in 1942 as a result, and they have not been paid.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Many have been paid on that basis.

Mr. GARDINER: Unless they seeded again in 1942 they have not been paid. Under the act if a farmer did seed rye in 1942 he could be paid, but if he had something else in he rould not be paid.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): How would the officials know? Farmers would in some cases seed in 1942 after the payments were made.

Mr. GARDINER: The payments were not made until after August in many cases.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I happen to know a bit about rye because it is grown in our country. The farmers who seeded rye in 1941 were paid for it in 1942. They have filed no return as for rye seeded in 1942. The officials do not know whether they seeded rye or not. They reduced their wheat acreage by growing coarse grains and they were paid for that. Many of them would not have sown rye in 1942 had it not been stated that they would be paid in 1943 after July 1. They will not be paid for the coarse grains as they were paid in 1942.

Mr. GARDINER: They will be paid for land out of wheat through seeding rye.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): They will receive for both acreages? Is that right?

Mr. GARDINER: The different years should be dealt with separately. If a man reduced his wheat acreage in 1941 and he did it by having rye seeded, he drew \$2 in 1941. That man was paid another \$2 after July 1, 1942. The hon, member will find that many payments have been made to the farmers of whom he is speaking. If a farmer carried his rye seeding acreage through into 1942 he got his second \$2, because he reduced wheat acreage in 1941, not in 1942. He gets \$2 for having reduced his acreage in 1942, and if he carries his wheat acreage reduction through seeding rye into 1943, he gets another \$2 after July 1, 1943, but from now on we are only paying the \$2 once on all of it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Let me see if I understand it. A man grew rye in 1941 and in 1942. He has 400 acres as his basic wheat acreage. He reseeded rye in 1942, on which the minister says he will be paid in 1943. He is also going to sow 100 acres of coarse [Mr. Gardiner.]

grains. He is going to reduce his basic wheat acreage by 100 acres. Will he be paid \$2 an acre on coarse grains and \$2 on rye in 1943?

Mr. GARDINER: He will be paid \$2 on the 100 acres in coarse grains and \$4 on the rye—\$2 in 1942 and \$2 in 1943, if any part of it was in rye. I think the difficulty which my hon, friend has is one which many have had who have been considering this question. He is thinking in terms of this same acreage. It is not necessarily the same acreage at all. A man must reduce his wheat acreage; it does not matter whether it is in the same field or in some other field. But he must reduce his wheat acreage before he can get any payment, and then he ought to be paid for every acre by which he reduces his wheat acreage.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He was paid \$4 on rye at one time.

Mr. GARDINER: Right up until now he got \$4, made up from two payments of \$2 each in two successive years.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): So that now he is going to be paid \$2?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is not carrying out the agreement.

Mr. GARDINER: We are still carrying out the agreement of 1942.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): But he will not get it on coarse grain in the same manner as in 1942 and 1941.

Mr. GARDINER: He does not get it twice on any land. He has not been paid twice; he gets one payment divided into two, whether it is grass or rye. If it is coarse grain he gets one payment. If in the fall he seeds that same land to grass or rye he will get another two dollars the next year, but not a second two dollars in 1942.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Have all payments been made on the same basis for grass and rye?

Mr. GARDINER: Except where mistakes have been made.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Then there have been hundreds if not thousands of mistakes made.

Mr. GARDINER: No; the payments are not yet completed.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not trying to embarrass anyone, but I know something about it; I have spent a good deal of time tracing farmers' cases at the superintendent's