

Q. Staying with the 1952 figures, if you are able to maintain the 1952 figures with a production of 664 million, and sales of 386 million it means there will be a larger carrying surplus with the new crop?—A. I am not just sure what your point is Mr. Castleden. I think as I said earlier that a few years ago in respect to our exports we were quite concerned as to a figure of 235 million which seemed at that time quite an adequate figure with respect to exports based on previous experience.

Q. You had to turn down buyers?—A. Yes, and we were working on the International Wheat Agreement figure and wondering about that figure. Now, last year we had record sales beyond I think, anybody's conception. This year our sales are down, but we do not know what the position will be when we come to the end of the crop year. The sales will definitely be down from last year, and the crop production is up, a way up. I think that it can be said that the reason for the accumulated surpluses in Canada after the last crop year are definitely not the lack of sales, but the substantial production in the two previous crop years.

Q. I think we can all agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we go on to number 8, transportation?

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. Before we leave this matter of exports, at the top of page 7 in connection with exports to the United States of 23.1 million bushels, of which 5.8 million bushels were for milling, and the remainder principally low grade wheat for feeding purposes, what were the grades of the wheat and the prices we got for them?—A. Mostly No. 6 went into the United States. You are referring now to the low grade wheat?

Q. Yes. Your statement is: "principally low grade wheat for feeding purposes" went to the United States.—A. Yes. It was largely No. 6 and the prices were variable. They ranged from around \$1.55 to \$1.70 I think, somewhere in there. It depended upon the demand position at the time. The price of our low grade wheat going into the United States has a very definite relationship to the price of American corn which is a competitive feed and dependent largely on the position at the time as to price.

Q. This is principally No. 6?—A. Yes.

Q. In feed?—A. No. 6 is a feed grain, but is a higher grade than the feed wheat. There was not a great deal of feed wheat available. Those big surpluses were mostly No. 5 and No. 6 and, going into the United States, there is a provision that on wheat going in with a 30 per cent damaged kernels, there is a 5 per cent ad valorem duty, and in many instances No. 5 would not qualify because No. 5 would not have that amount of damage in it. So, the wheat that went in for feed purposes was to a considerable extent No. 6. There was some No. 5, but No. 6 was predominant.

Q. Was the \$1.70 figure for the No. 5 or No. 6?—A. I would have to look up the figures, but I would say that No. 6 varied from about \$1.55 to \$1.70. This is just from memory. And No. 5 varied from \$1.60 to \$1.80, or somewhere in that direction.

Q. What does the feed wheat sell for?—A. About ten cents less than the No. 6; 8 to 10 cents under No. 6.

By Mr. Johnson (Kindersley):

Q. What was the storage in Churchill last year in the terminals?—A. About 2,250,000 bushels.

Q. The capacity?—A. Yes. The practical capacity. The elevator itself, Mr. Minister, is 2½ million bushels. You built it. The practical capacity would be around 2,250,000 bushels, I think.

Q. What is it at the head of the lakes?