

Q. I was going to ask you, Mr. Wesson, if you had the figures for the average of last year. Thirteen bushels was the average for 1941. You then said that the estimated crop of wheat would be in the neighbourhood of 270 million bushels this year on the basis of 17 million acres. I understood you to say—I did not get it clearly—that the average would be about 16 bushels per acre. Is that what you say?—A. I think the present year is about 13.

Q. The figure for this year is 13?—A. Yes.

Q. That is a very high estimate, 270 million bushels, assuming a better average than last year of 13 bushels to the acre?—A. Yes.

Q. Could I also ask you if I caught you correctly when I thought you said that the 50 million bushels of wheat that is sold for domestic consumption could have the price raised without affecting the treasury? Did I understand you to say that the increasing of the price of wheat would only affect the price of a loaf of bread in Regina 1-1/7 cents? What price had you in mind raising it to? Was the price you were suggesting the parity price?—A. \$1.25.

Q. A parity price of \$1.25. I should like to ask you another question. You mentioned \$1.25 as the parity price figure. Then you mentioned the fact that 1926-29 had been taken as a general level for wages, etc. I should like to ask you how you arrived at \$1.25 in the light of the statement of the delegation to the government pointing out: "In terms of money, the average price of wheat for the calendar year 1926 was \$1.49 per bushel basis 1 Nor. in store at the Head of the Lakes, equal to a farm price of \$1.29 per bushel." Is the \$1.25 figure you gave the farm price or the Fort William price?—A. No. I think if you examine the brief you will find we were dealing with price levels when we took that 1926-29 figure which we called \$1.41. That was the average. Fifteen per cent on that to equalize the cost-of-living bonus would be \$1.62. That was not a parity price. We suggested that if there was to be a price ceiling on wheat that it should not be less than that figure so that some time the price might reach it. We admitted we did not know what the parity price is, but we were quite willing to take the figures from the Bureau of Statistics. The Serle Grain Co. says that is \$1.20. We do not know whether \$1.17, \$1.20 or \$1.25. I used \$1.25 merely as a figure to illustrate.

Q. In the light of Mr. Wesson's statement I want to read to him what appears in his brief. He said on page 5 of his statement: "The position of wheat, however, is a notable exception. Taking the calendar year 1926 as a parity period, by the end of 1941 the index figure representing general wholesale prices stood at 93·6; while the wheat price index for the same year was 49·5. In terms of money, the average price of wheat for the calendar year 1926 was \$1.49 per bushel, basis 1 Nor. in store at the Head of the Lakes, equal to a farm price of \$1.29 per bushel, while the average 1941 price amounted to 74 cents per bushel on the Lakehead basis, or about 54 cents on the farm. In other words, while the general wholesale price index is now getting close to the 1926 level, the wheat index is just about one-half of the 1926 price level." In other words, as I understand it, in terms of the purchasing power of money, the price to-day would be \$1.49 basis Fort William in relation to 1926-1927 figures?—A. Yes, it might be. You are taking the 1926-1927 period. You might just as well take the 1913-1914 period.

Q. There is one other question I wanted to ask you, Mr. Wesson: you made a statement in which you added up income—assuming that you had 270,000,000 bushels of wheat at 90 cents a bushel; that would give you \$196,000,000 farm price?—A. Yes.

Q. Then you said you add on to that the bonus as wheat income—if you want to call that wheat income—and that is a total of 250,000,000; is that correct?—A. No. I was dealing, Mr. Chairman, with the bonus paid last year of 20,000,000 dollars as prairie farm income; and assuming 30,000,000 dollars for