

Mr. FRASER: I think the only way that you could make a separation would be on protein content because Reward varies in different localities as well as the other does. Reward grown in the North would not be worth the same grade as Reward grown in the South.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: But there would not be the same variation as there would with Marquis?

Mr. FRASER: Of course, Marquis comes down in grade.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: It would be easier to distinguish between Reward and Marquis, would it not, than between Garnet and Marquis?

Mr. FRASER: Well, I would not like to say that. We have been making separation of Garnet from other wheats, but we have not tried to make a separation of Reward and Garnet. We probably could do it with a little experience.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: Reward practically all goes No. 1 in the North under anything like favourable conditions and it is about the only wheat that does.

Mr. FRASER: Yes, I think that is right.

Mr. BROWN: I think it would be a case of *reductio ad absurdum*.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: I object to the honourable member's rather perverted sense of humour. What we are discussing here is to get the best quality possible in our Canadian wheat, and if experiments prove that Reward wheat is better than Marquis wheat I think the honourable member himself is then *reductio ad absurdum* in making the interjection, because what we are trying to do is to improve the quality of our wheat, and if Reward is better than Marquis then we ought to consider Reward.

Mr. BROWN: There has been yet no person come forward to prove that Marquis and Reward cannot be satisfactorily milled together. That fact separates it entirely from the other fact that we have evidence that Garnet and Marquis cannot be satisfactorily milled with the other wheats, and it is just because I see the vast difference between those two positions that I used the expression I did, and I think my argument will stand examination.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: Not if it is based on quality.

The WITNESS: Might I suggest, Mr. Weir, that when you get down to handling carloads of grain on the individual quality the wheat business of Canada will be confined to the country.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: I appreciate the difficulty in that, but what I had in my mind was this, whether or not you feel from your visit to Continental Europe, or to Europe including the United Kingdom, that we might not be well advised to put pressure behind in the increasing of Reward?

The WITNESS: Oh, I think that would be a very good thing. At the same time, Reward is not suitable for the south.

*By Hon. Mr. Weir:*

Q. On account of yield?—A. Yield, yes. You would starve to death growing it.

Q. The results of the Experimental Farm I do not think show such a discrepancy in yield. Of course, the conditions are much more ideal?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Davies:*

Q. In 1932, I think, before this committee, you expressed the viewpoint that you would not be surprised to see the spread of Garnet go to 10 cents if it was graded separately.—A. Was that statement not made in connection with the deliveries to be made on the futures market. I think that is what was meant. If you suddenly throw 25,000,000 bushels of wheat on the market—