

young people to go back to the land when they have seen what their fathers and mothers have had to endure and know what they themselves have endured? Platitudes will not do much towards getting them back to the land; you have to do more than that.

There is one other report to which I should like to refer in connection with the cost of raising wheat. We are taking our facts and figures from authentic sources; there is no guess-work about it. The hon. member for Wood Mountain (Mr. Donnelly) asked: How can you estimate the cost of raising a bushel of wheat? Then he went on to mention one place in his constituency where a farmer had raised wheat at a cost of two dollars a bushel. How did he know it cost two dollars a bushel? He did not know at all; he was just guessing. Then he said that another farmer right across the road raised wheat at a cost of something less than a dollar. He did not know what the cost was; he was just guessing. And the illustrations he gave contradicted his own statement that you could not estimate the cost of raising wheat per bushel.

Mr. HANSELL: He was not practical.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): He was not practical. Now I quote figures from people who have made a scientific investigation of this problem. I quote from the *Cost of Producing Farm Crops in the Prairie Provinces*, by E. S. Hopkins, J. M. Armstrong and H. D. Mitchell, division of field husbandry, dominion experimental farms, bulletin No. 159—new series, Department of Agriculture. At page 11, under the heading, "Cost of producing wheat after fallow," I find these figures. So that when hon. members say that we cannot find out the cost of raising wheat, it is simply idiotic, nothing short of—I was going to say insanity, but I will not use that word. The report says:

The highest yield and lowest cost per bushel on any of the farms during the period from 1923 to 1930 occurred at Lethbridge in 1928, when 52.1 bushels per acre were produced at a total cost of \$18.32 per acre, or 35 cents per bushel.

That is quite low. These figures are taken from costs of producing wheat on eight experimental farms in the prairie provinces. The report goes on:

The lowest yield and highest cost per bushel occurred at Scot in 1924 when a yield of only 7.0 bushels was secured at a total cost of \$14.08, or \$2.01 per bushel.

Will anybody tell me that we cannot strike an average cost between those two figures? The average would be \$1.18.

Mr. GARDINER: Between those two points and for those years.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes, but it is not an impossibility to strike an average cost, is it? It can be done, and it should be done. Then you would have a figure that would be equitable. There is no use in raising the minimum price from 60 to 70 cents for no good reason at all. There should be some sound, logical basis for the price you fix. Political pressure should not enter into it at all, or influence the government one way or the other. They should do what is just and right, and not yield to political pressure. Just because some members who are unfortunate enough to represent the Liberal party in the west at this time feel their seats slipping, they should not be permitted to bring pressure on the government. The government should present its legislation in a businesslike way.

Mr. TUCKER: Without listening to the members, is that the idea?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Without listening to members who do not give facts and figures for what they are saying. At page 74 of Bulletin No. 159, from which I have just quoted, there is another reference to this question, and I read it because the Minister of Agriculture was speaking about half-section farms. Professor Hope in his report showed that the 55 cents per bushel cost was the cost on a half-section farm, and that the 30 to 40 cents cost was on a highly mechanized farm. You cannot have such a farm on a half-section, because it is not large enough for mechanized farming; you must necessarily go back to horses. Whether that is a good point or not I am not prepared to argue at the moment, but it is a factor that affects the cost of producing wheat. This report at page 74 refers to that and says:

The calculations are subject to modifications depending upon local conditions in different districts but undoubtedly indicate the effect of size of farm and method of operation on the cost of production and total net revenue.

The size of the farm is undoubtedly an important factor in profitable grain production. The one-quarter section farm seems entirely too small for this purpose, the reason being that the overhead costs for equipment and labour are altogether too high while the revenue obtained is much too small. The cost of producing wheat on such a farm, with an average yield of 18 bushels per acre, would be approximately \$1.02 per bushel.

That is the position the Minister of Agriculture is putting these people in. While it may be possible on a two-section farm, highly mechanized and with everything to the best