

Q. Two years ago?—A. I was going to say that this year when we were discussing it, with every thought in the matter, it was discussed all the way from 2 cents to I think 5 cents; and we thought maybe 3 cents would be fair.

By the Hon. Mr. Weir:

Q. Below No. 2?—A. Yes, three cents for No. 2 Garnet below No. 1 Garnet; and 3 cents for No. 2 Garnet below No. 2 Northern.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. That would mean that No. 1 Garnet would equal No. 2 Northern?—
A. That is what we talked about.

By the Hon. Mr. Weir:

Q. Which, in your opinion, would bring the better price to the producer; the continuance of No. 2 in the Northern with Marquis and no Garnet; or No. 2 Northern with Garnet grown as it is?—A. Well, we have had experience with the former, and we know how we can dispose of it. We have had no experience by which to know how we can dispose of it in a separate grade.

Q. No, no; I mean No. 2 Northern with Marquis in it, as before Garnet came in; or No. 2 Northern with Garnet in it as it is now; which is the better No. 2 grown in the North from the standpoint of selling. What I have in mind is this: do you think it is a better No. 2 to sell with Garnet in it than Garnet would be in a separate grade, the result being that the price of Garnet would go down for a year or so and the effect then would be to have people go into the growing of Marquis, which might be still more detrimental against our No. 2 than to leave it with the Garnet in. Do you get my question?—A. Yes, I think I know what you mean. You can take the condition as it exists right now in the matter of price—

Q. With Garnet wheat grown in the North, we have No. 2 Wheat with Garnet mixed in it. If there were no Garnet we would have No. 2 with possibly Marquis—they might go to Reward or to Marquis—it depends on the yield—but that question would come into it?—A. Well, it is a hard thing to answer.

Q. You cannot base it on the demand before Garnet came in, because there were a lot of complaints then?—A. You will notice that before Garnet came in the spreads were even wider between No. 1 and No. 2 Northern, according to this list that you have here, than they are now. That is partly accounted for because of the fact that we were enjoying a higher level of prices, and naturally the percentage of difference in value was wider. Right now it appears that the millers on this continent—we do not sell wheat separated abroad, it goes on our certificate generally speaking; I think one or two lots have been sold—but generally speaking the millers in this country will buy Marquis No. 2 Northern, free from Garnet, and pay more for it than they will with Garnet.

Q. Would that be Northern wheat, or Southern wheat?—A. They will buy from the south, largely; there is less Garnet, of course, and they will pay more for it separated than they will for a No. 2 Northern, with the Garnet in it in this country. The millers in the Old Country do not get that opportunity, they get it altogether. I do not know whether or not that is the answer to your question.

Q. No, it is not altogether. The point I am concerned about is this, the quality of our wheat. In that No. 2 Northern grown in the North with Marquis, it was a poorer looking wheat, at least. Now, with Garnet in it, it is a better looking wheat?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, I think that the millers perhaps would be more anxious to buy it—I am just discussing the Northern entirely with the Garnet in it—