

*By Mr. Millar:*

Q. Mr. Ramsay, just what did you refer to; I did not catch your answer to the last question asked you. You said that the reason why Preston, Stanley and some other varieties would not pay the same price was not necessary on account of the protein; what is it on account of?—A. Flour volume.

Q. Is that not the same thing?—A. Volume and quality.

Q. Did you say volume?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that not related entirely to the weight per bushel?—A. No.

Q. Take the Stanley and Marquis; you get the same weight of bushel?—

A. One wheat will produce more bran than another wheat.

Q. But if you have the same weight per bushel, you get the same quality?—

A. Not necessarily.

*By Mr. Totzke:*

Q. A high quantity of protein does not always indicate a high quality of protein?—A. That has something to do with it; the quality of the protein is a factor.

Q. Is it not a major factor?—A. I could not say, I do not know enough about it.

*By Mr. Vallance:*

Q. There is one thing I want to ask you about. Occupying the office you do in the Pool, is the Pool approaching this whole question from the stand-points of how much they can get on the average bushel for the producer? Do you think that it is a fair thing, after taking into consideration these things which we say are factors in the lowering of our standards, and which would indicate that the farmer in the north part of the wheat belt must of necessity not be growing as high a quality of wheat as we are in the south; what we would like to do in the south is not to grade according to the quality in the north; what we would like to do, is to give the farmer in the southern wheat belt what his wheat is worth and let the other fellow take what his wheat is worth. I can see that the Pool cannot take any other attitude, but that is the way we feel about it, growing the hard wheat on the bald-headed prairie?—A. To some extent this amendment of No. 3 Northern Wheat would take care of that situation, because that damp starchy wheat would not grade No. 3 as it does now; it would go into No. 4, and they would get as much for that No. 4 as they get for the No. 3 now.

Q. But raising his would not raise our price; you would raise the standard?—A. You would get a better price for No. 3 Northern.

Q. The spread would not be as great?—A. No.

*By Mr. Coote:*

Q. Will you explain how your proposed raising of the Standard No. 3 will keep the other out?—A. Yes. It will not have 25 per cent hard red vitreous kernels.

Q. The wheat the Old Country miller would get might be 75 per cent less starch?—A. He would still have the value in the 25 per cent. It is a three-grade business, not a one-grade, and it must be something that will take care of No. 3 Wheat. You could not have your No. 3 on the same high standard as No. 1. It is a scaling down; your No. 1 takes care of 60; your No. 2, 45, and your No. 3, 25 per cent.

Q. But there is lots of No. 3 that has a high percentage of hard, red vitreous, but it is graded down by damage, or something of that nature. You are going to give the private terminal operator a splendid opportunity of mixing that No. 3 with wheat with more starch, or of some other description?—A. He would have the chance, but we would be limiting his opportunities.

[Mr. E. B. Ramsay]