

Mr. FRASER: I might say this; in connection with our No. 1 Northern: that we have not been excluding Garnet strictly from our No. 1 Northern. At the present time we will allow from 3 to 3½ per cent in our No. 1 Northern as it comes along; so our No. 1 Northern is not strictly free from Garnet. We did that because our No. 2 Northern might carry 100 per cent. I do not know that this information should be given out to the world's markets, because it would appear to me from the evidence we have had that they believe our No. 1 Northern is free from Garnet.

Mr. DONNELLY: I would like to ask Mr. Fraser one question: can he tell the committee why it is—we hear it said that about 14 per cent of the grain grown in Canada is Garnet wheat—before this Committee it is said that in the No. 2 Northern that goes out by the Pacific Coast, contains up to 80 per cent of Garnet, and that going out by way of the head of the Lakes has somewhere about 50 to 60 per cent; how can that be if we are only growing about 14 per cent Garnet in Western Canada.

Mr. FRASER: Probably 90 to 95 per cent of the Garnet graded is going in to No. 2 Northern, into one grade; it is not spread over all the grade, it is only going into one grade; which will probably bring it up to an average of 35 to 40 per cent. Naturally with most of it going out by way of Vancouver, the percentage is high there and lower at the head of the Lakes.

Mr. DONNELLY: Would that mean also that Garnet has a tendency to be a higher grade all the time—with very little in the lower grade?

Mr. FRASER: Yes, it would have that tendency.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to call to your attention the fact that there is a motion before the committee. I think perhaps it would be wiser for us to dispose of the motion before asking further technical questions.

Mr. DAVIES: I would like to concur in what the Minister of Agriculture has said, and the motion before the committee has my approval. I am afraid I disagree with what Mr. Carmichael has said. I do not for a moment desire to rehash again before this committee all the evidence that went to court in 1932. All those who are familiar with the report made in 1932 will recollect that one of the most cogent reasons advanced at that time as to why Garnet should be graded separately was because of the spread which developed a No. 2 Northern out of Vancouver. Now, we find that the position since that time has been reversed, and I agree with the Minister of Agriculture that we should know why it is that that reason was advanced at that time when it is now the other way. As far as I am concerned personally, I do not think that there is any other question before those whom I represent that is more important than the question which is now before the committee. I do not think it would be inaccurate to say that all the wheat grown north of the North Saskatchewan and beyond a radius of 25 miles from Edmonton—as far as Athabaska constituency is concerned, Garnet is grown very extensively; in many districts it is the exclusive grain, I know for a fact that north of the North Saskatchewan there are countless districts which grow nothing else than Garnet. Furthermore, I think I should point out that the Garnet growers of Northern Alberta do not feel that they have had good representation on the grain standards committee. Mention was made of the fact that Mr. George Bennett was a member of that committee. I do not know whether it is correct or not, but it was suggested in this committee at the last meeting that Mr. Bennett himself grows Reward; but he does not come from a Garnet area. Furthermore, he is, if I remember correctly, a director of the Alberta Wheat Pool, which itself is on record as being, along with the other two pools, in favor of separate grading of Garnet. To that extent Mr. Bennett is prejudiced in being able to act fairly for Garnet