

wheat acreage reduction added to the total revenue, of 100,000,000 dollars from the sale of wheat, amounting to the total of 150,000,000—there is no connection between that and your figure.

Q. No.—A. And, I say on this year's wheat price on 280,000,000 bushels—and we can sell 280,000,000 bushels on a basis of 90 cents, which will bring \$194,000,000. That, of course, does not include the income which may accrue in the form of flax and coarse grain bonuses; which bonus, has no connection with the price of wheat.

Q. That raises this question: would you, Mr. Wesson, consider this bonus as wheat income?—A. No, I would not.

Q. Another thing: the statement has been made repeatedly that when your delegation was asking for an initial payment of \$1; the suggestion has been made repeatedly that the farmer has been receiving 70 cents basis Fort William, and receiving another 30 cents per bushel by reason of the 30-cent bonus; and taken with the 70-cent payment that makes it \$1 a bushel; do you take it on that basis, that the farmer has been receiving \$1 a bushel on wheat?—A. No. I am not merely expressing my own opinion on that. The west does not look at it that way. You see, after all, we have a lot of farmers who have summer fallowed a lot of their land and they could not take advantage of the wheat acreage reduction bonus. The only income they could get out of this bonus this year if they had a crop would be 75 cents an acre on a restricted—a total amount of \$150—if you want to take that and divide that amongst the wheat acreage. On the other hand, I think I heard Dr. Donnelly make a quotation in the house the other day where one fellow got 300 bushels of wheat and received \$2,700 of bonus; and one way or another that figured out at \$9 a bushel. Of course, you could have no wheat and be making a million dollars a bushel. I say that while you may argue that if you take wheat acreage out of production and you put it in summer fallow, you may argue that you get an increased price on the wheat on the land on which you produce wheat; but I do not agree with that, you are merely being indemnified for not producing wheat on that land and you are spending most of your money on summer fallowing. That is not increasing the price which you get for your wheat.

Q. It is still income?—A. But not wheat income.

By Mr. Furniss:

Q. But is it not a fact that you are being paid a bonus in lieu of wheat; are you not being paid a bonus in lieu of wheat which would have been produced if it had not been taken out of wheat acreage?—A. No. I maintain and the people of western Canada maintain that that is merely an indemnity for not producing wheat on certain acreage.

Q. Should it not be considered as adding to the value of the wheat you do produce?—A. I think it would be just as sound to say that if the government continues to pay this \$2 for growing coarse grains and flax that you should add that to the price you get for your wheat. As I see it, I do not think such an argument could hope to succeed. However, it is a matter of argument.

By Mr. Dechene:

Q. It is wheat income just the same?—A. The trouble is that the people who raise wheat are not the people who get all this bonus?

Q. You were talking about wheat farmers?—A. Yes. You see, under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act the people who produce no wheat get that; the man producing wheat does not get it.

By Mr. Golding:

Q. Suppose you went on growing your wheat, what would you get if there were no market for it?—A. The question is: suppose we keep growing this wheat—