

bushels per year. That is now being supplied by Californian Bay Brewing and by Chilian barley, and some of the Danubian barleys. We would have to compete with those.

At the present time Trebi is not acceptable, at least not to the highest class trade. It would have to be improved. In my opinion, the man who produces barley and chooses Trebi, if he produces the highest type and comes within one of these three top grades, he has an opportunity to possibly get a premium, but if he does not come within the three top grades, if it goes down into the feed grades, the thick husk that is characteristic of Trebi is objected to by the feeders.

Now, we are in this position: Trebi is being grown. Shall we make grades to take care of the high-class trade, or shall it be condemned? The market will be a limited one, at the most ten million bushels a year, as we have to compete as well with Chilian, Californian and Danubian barleys, and if it is over-produced it is liable to hurt the price of our Feed Barley, because it is too thick in the husk. We are not condemning the O.A.C. apparently. That is the impression the synopsis of our report published in the newspaper some time ago has given to some people. We simply make the statement that O.A.C. 21 or barley of that type has absolutely no place in the British brewing trade, brewing for beer-making. The O.A.C. type barleys have a distinct place in the distilling trade, malt extract, and some of the other allied trades, and O.A.C. barley in Canada locally is being used as a brewing barley. We are not condemning O.A.C., we are simply making the statement that it is not acceptable, or not useful, for the British brewing trade.

I want to go on from this briefly and say something about feed grades. Professor Harrison has mentioned that Great Britain and Denmark require a distinctly higher type of feed grain than our feed barley is, and they have been purchasing mostly 4 C.W. When we go into Germany, the biggest feed barley market in the world, we have 4 C.W., the next grade Rejected, and the next grade Feed Barley.

No. 4 C.W. is too high in quality for feed requirements in Germany; it is not too high in itself, but it is too high in price, and the feeders are not willing to pay that price. Rejected they consider is something that is condemned, and while rejected according to the regulations may only contain 10 per cent of wild oats, that is about the amount they are willing to take. They will not consider Rejected because they regard it as something that is condemned, and you cannot sell Rejected barley even with a Canadian certificate, in Germany, nor can you sell it in Belgium or Holland, which re-ship about 50 per cent of what they buy. They supply the west of Germany through the Rhine and the canal system that exists there.

No. 4 C.W. is too high, Rejected they will not consider, and Feed Barley contains too high a percentage of wild oats, up to 18 per cent. There is the objection of the feeder, who will not have it, it has too large a percentage of black oat hulls in the meal that is supplied. On top of that the German Food-stuffs Act prohibits the importation of grain that is not shipped as grown, and they maintain that our Feed Barley, when it is shipped with 18 per cent of wild oats—and it does contain 18 per cent of wild oats, is mixed to the minimum of the grade. On account of the high percentage of wild oats it will not be taken in at the Customs duty on Feed Barley, which is 20 marks per metric ton, but the rate on oats of 50 marks per metric ton will be imposed, and that actually shuts it out of the German market. Bear in mind that the German market takes 70 million to 80 million bushels per year of that Feed barley. When you go into Belgium there is no duty on barley imported into Belgium, but if barley or any other grain contains 15 per cent of oats or more, it does carry a duty of 6 Belgian francs per hundred kilos, and that duty of 6 francs per hundred kilos means approximately 9 cents a bushel, so you are shut out of that market too.

[Mr. Paul Brecht.]