

growers. Who would think of nominating a member of a Toronto conservative executive to be president of a free trade association? It is an essentially similar parallel, to about that extent only would Mr. George Bennett be capable of acting on behalf of the Garnet growers.

Now, personally, I do not for a moment desire to obstruct this committee. Furthermore, I do not think that the Garnet growers insist on Garnet being graded with No. 2 Northern; but I think they are entitled to insist that very clear evidence should be advanced as to why that wheat should be graded separately. After all, the farmers of Northern Alberta are growing Garnet to-day for no other reason than that the government told them to grow it. There is an area in Northern Alberta where the government went in and distributed Garnet wheat fifteen years ago. The government told them it was good wheat, and I respectfully suggest that nothing should be done to discriminate against it, or to put it in a position where it makes it impossible for them to grow it, unless there is very, very clear evidence to show that that should be done. And I do think, particularly in view of the statement made by the Minister this morning, that there is not sufficient evidence in that direction.

Mr. PERLEY: I have had some experience both in growing and marketing Garnet wheat, and in buying it as an elevator operator for the last fifteen or twenty years—ever since Garnet has been on the market. Now, I cannot see any useful purpose to be served in rehashing this thing again. We had very exhaustive evidence here two years ago in every line. I was on the sub-committee that had to do with the producing of evidence and the preparation of the report, and the evidence went to show very conclusively that it should have been a separate grade. I believed at that time, and I believe the report contemplated, that after two years it would be again considered; and that would give those growing Garnet wheat an opportunity to change to some other variety. I think the growers of Garnet wheat have been changing and taking up Reward; it is perhaps equally early, and as good a wheat. I think the evidence that has been produced here on the last day we met is sufficient further evidence that we should this year take the step that it is proposed to take by this bill.

With regard to spreads: I have had some experience in buying grain. There is nothing to these spreads, because that is a condition that varies from year to year, depending on the quality of the crop. We have had conditions of wheat in the west where the spread between the No. 1 and the No. 4 would narrow up, owing to the quality of crop. I say, from year to year the spreads vary from that standard as to quality.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: Might I interject, Mr. Perley, to point out that the spread to which I had reference related to the 1932 crop. It is not a difference from year to year.

Mr. PERLEY: You have taken the 1931-32 crop; you might have a condition altogether different.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: From what?

Mr. PERLEY: Well, the spreads would be much smaller one year than another. You might have a year with a very high percentage of say No. 1 wheat and there would be a demand for a No. 2 wheat for mixing purposes and so forth. The mills would require it, therefore the spread would narrow up between No. 1 and No. 2 Northern. Or you may have the opposite situation where you would have a great quantity of No. 2 wheat, your wheat crop would only go into No. 2 and there would be a great demand for No. 1, which would work out. I think Mr. Fraser can verify my statement, that from year to year the spreads vary on account of the quality of the crop.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I suggest that we should dispose of this motion which is before the committee. Mr. Dupuis has moved, seconded by Mr. Smith, that