

bushels or 35 per cent. This is exactly the same percentage of the United Kingdom trade we had during the same period in 1933-34. Now, with regard to Mr. Richardson's suggestion, I would just point out that to have sold another 75,000,000 bushels to the United Kingdom would have meant our getting 85 per cent of the British market. The largest percentage we ever received was during 1932-33, when the United Kingdom took slightly over 50 per cent of her requirements from Canada.

Q. What were the requirements that year? We do not carry that in our heads accurately—was it 204,000,000 that year?—A. 1932-33?

Q. Yes.—A. I have the figures here, Mr. Chairman, some place.

Q. Never mind if you have not them right at hand.—A. It would be approximately running from 204,000,000 up to 220,000,000.

Q. I didn't know they ever got as high as 220,000,000. For the reasons you have given, your opinion is that Mr. Richardson was mistaken as to that?—A. Yes, I am; and there is another point that might be mentioned. If the market price was reduced to 70 cents in Canada, we still might not move out very much wheat due to the reduction in price because there is a short position in the market.

Q. You mean the shorts would cover their commitments at 70 cents and it might not go out of the country; is that what you say?—A. Yes. You, of course, would move some wheat.

Q. I had not thought of that.—A. But at the same time there is a great deal you would not have moved.

Q. Might I ask one more question which has to do with something said here about the acreage in Australia and Argentine being increased at the expense of Canada. I suppose you have the world tables prepared by Broomhall. It might be better for you to give them?—A. Yes, I think I have them here.

Q. You might put them on the record, although I think part of them are in Hansard now. We may as well have them here.—A. I have the figures here, the sown acreage in exporting countries. These are the figures of the International Institute of Agriculture.

Q. At Rome?—A. Yes. In 1928 the Argentine acreage was 22.78 million; in 1934, 18.48 million. In other words, from 1928 to 1934, they reduced their acreage 4.30 million acres.

Q. 4,300,000?—A. 4½, really.

Q. What is the position of Canada during the same period?—A. Canada in 1928 had 24.34 million acres; in 1934, 24.26—a reduction of .08.

*By Hon. Mr. Ralston:*

Q. .08 million, is that it?—A. Yes.

Australia in the same period had 14.84 in 1928 and 12.97 in 1934, a reduction of 1.87 million acres. The United States in 1928 had 48.43—

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it would be easier if you say 48,430,000 acres.

The WITNESS: Yes. And then a reduction in 1934 to 41,000,000 acres; a reduction of almost 7½ million acres. The figures for 1930 to 1934 are interesting. In 1930 reduction of acreage in the Argentine 21,500,000; in 1934, 18.5 million; a reduction of 2.80.

*By Hon. Mr. Ralston:*

Q. 2.80 what?—A. 2,800,000 acres.

Q. You have got acres, not percentages?

The CHAIRMAN: At any rate you have 2.8, or 2,800,000 acres.

*By Hon. Mr. Ralston:*

Q. You haven't these in percentages have you?—A. No, these are actual acreage, it can be worked out. Australia in that period, 1930, had 18,160,000 acres; reduced to 12,970,000 acres, a reduction of 5,190,000 acres.