

Two sections

A comparison between gross receipts for a two section farm in 1938 with fixed price of 80c for No. 1 Northern, at Fort William, and probable returns in 1939 with initial payment 70c No. 1, Fort William, plus bonus under act to assist in prairie provinces.

No deductions have been made for seed in either case nor for the 1 per cent payable under the bonus acreage scheme.

Assuming 1,280 acres in cultivation and 640 acres of this seeded to wheat.

Yield	1938		1939			
	Farm price 60c. per bushel		Farm price 50c per bushel plus bonus		Total	Loss or gain
		Total Receipts	Wheat	Bonus	Receipts	new plan
20 bus...		\$7,680	\$6,400		\$6,400	Loss \$1,280
19 "		7,296	6,080		6,080	" 1,216
18 "		6,912	5,760		5,760	" 1,152
17 "		6,528	5,440		5,440	" 1,088
16 "		6,144	5,120		5,120	" 1,024
15 "		5,760	4,800		4,800	" 960
14 "		5,376	4,480		4,480	" 896
13 "		4,992	4,160		4,160	" 832
12 "		4,608	3,840	plus \$200	4,040	" 768
11 "		4,224	3,520	" 200	3,720	" 704
10 "		3,840	3,200	" 200	3,400	" 440
9 "		3,456	2,880	" 200	3,080	" 376
8 "		3,072	2,560	" 300	2,860	" 212
7 "		2,688	2,240	" 300	2,540	" 148
6 "		2,304	1,920	" 300	2,220	" 84
5 "		1,920	1,600	" 300	1,900	" 20
4 "		1,536	1,280	" 400	1,680	Gain 144
3 "			960	" 400	1,360	" 208
2 "			640	" 400	1,040	" 272
1 "		384	320	" 400	720	" 336
0 "				400	400	" 400

These tables will show that the acreage bonus scheme will be of benefit only to the small farmer with low yields. On a half section farm, for instance, with from no crop at all up to nine bushels to the acre, the farmer is better off with the acreage bonus scheme and a 70 cent guaranteed minimum price, assuming the market price does not go above that.

Mr. DONNELLY: I would like the hon. member to read his figures, because I have a table that shows the contrary.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I may have taken a different number of acres of wheat.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): We gave the hon. member unanimous consent to place the tables on *Hansard*.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I had permission. The hon. member for Wood Mountain (Mr. Donnelly) may come along afterwards and show wherein my figures are wrong. I will pass a copy of my tables down to him so that he may look them over. On a half-section basis, from nine bushels down, the farmer is farther ahead under a combination of bills numbers 82 and 63, but above nine bushels he stands to lose—probably not as heavily; but he does stand to lose some. Of course he would not lose as heavily as he would have under the 60 cent rate.

[Mr. T. C. Douglas.]

Coming to the one-section farm, the farmer who has no crop, or the one who has up to six bushels to the acre, stands to gain, but above that he stands to lose. On the two-section farm the man who has no crop, or the man who has up to four bushels to the acre, stands to gain, whereas anyone above four bushels to the acre stands to lose.

Mr. DONNELLY: How many acres have you on a section?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I assume fifty per cent of the amount under cultivation, sown to wheat. The point I am trying to make—whether or not it may be true in all areas—is that in a great many areas of Saskatchewan the tendency of this acreage bonus scheme will be to keep the farmers on the submarginal land, which, as the minister said last night, was broken up during war time, is unsuitable for agriculture and should have been left for ranging purposes. By virtue of the bonus, people who are getting low yields from lands will be able to remain on those lands—a procedure which I suggest is not economically profitable—and farmers who are on good land with good yields will find themselves penalized to pay for it.

My contention is that under Bill 82 the government is going to drive into bankruptcy farmers who now live in the wheat producing areas of western Canada. The