section farm that might be in my section of the country, at various yields to the acre. It is a 320 acre farm, with 160 acres in wheat. It would take about 1½ bushels to the acre for seed; when it was cleaned there would be half a bushel to feed to the chickens and pigs, leaving one bushel for seed. Last year's price of 80 cents, less the cost of delivering it to market and other costs, represents a return on the farm of 60 cents a bushel. This year at 70 cents at the head of the lakes, with 20 cents off for delivery, leaves 50 cents on the farm. At various yields per acre the results would be as follows:

Yield per acre	Yield for 160 acres	Yield at 60c (1938)	1938 at 60c	Yield at 50c (1939)	With Bonus (1939)	Return per bushel 1939 basis
12	1,920	$1,008	.60	$840	$1,000	$ .59½
11	1,760	912	.60	760	920	.60
10	1,600	816	.60	680	840	.62
9	1,440	720	.60	600	760	.63⅓
8	1,280	624	.60	520	760	.73
7	1,120	528	.60	440	680	.77
6	960	432	.60	360	600	.83
5	800	336	.60	280	520	.91
4	640	240	.60	200	520	1.30
3	480	144	.60	120	440	1.83
2	320	....	...	....	320	....
1	160	....	...	....	320	....
0	320	....	...	....	320	....

It is assumed that the total of 320 acres are broken. The bonuses paid on half the cultivated acreage at the rate of $1 per acre when the yield is 9 to 12 bushels per acre, $1.50 per acre when yield is 5 to 8 bushels, and $2 per acre when yield is 0 to 4 bushels per acre.

All those having under twelve bushels to the acre will be much better off under this scheme than last year, on a half-section farm. This in every case will assist the half-section farm and the small farmer. I support these bills and I think the government have done well in introducing them.

Before I take my seat I should like to make one criticism and offer one suggestion to the government. First I should like to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Manion), who eulogized the work of Mr. McFarland and the profits he had made. They went on to tell us how much they did for the western farmers, how much good they had done and the profits they had made. They may have made some profits, but I do not agree that this profit went to the farmers of the west. The leader of the opposition quoted the prices received by the farmer for his wheat, but I should like to quote some figures from page 23 of the Turgeon report, from which they were quoting also, as to the prices paid during the last fifteen years:

Crop year	Cents per bushel
1924-25	169·0
1925-26	151·2
1926-27	146·3
1927-28	146·3
1928-29	124·0
1929-30	124·0

Then the Conservatives came in, and see what happened:

1930-31	64·2
1931-32	59·8
1932-33	54·3
1933-34	68·1
1934-35	81·8

Then the Liberal government came back, and these were the prices:

1935-36	85·1
1936-37	122·7
1937-38 (8 months)	139·0

These figures show that while the Liberals were in power we received over $1 per bushel every year but one, but that we never received $1 while the Conservatives were in power. Yes, Mr. McFarland did make a profit, and how did he make it? At one time they were buying wheat from the farmer for 18 or 19 cents, paying only 38 cents at Fort William. If they could not make money buying wheat at that price they could never make it. Is any credit coming to Mr. McFarland for having made money in buying wheat at that price? When these people talk about the price of wheat they should consider the fact that at one time, under the Conservative government, wheat went down to 18 and 19 cents on the farm.

I intend to support both these bills, and at the same time I should like to offer one suggestion. At present the wheat growers of