

Mr. IRVINE: Generally speaking country elevators do not have cleaning equipment. Our tolerance requirements for grain for export are so low the country elevators say they cannot clean the grain to this degree, so even if the grain was cleaned at the country elevator and shipped and it contained only 1 per cent of dockage it would have to be cleaned again at the shipping terminal before it could be shipped.

Mr. LANGLOIS: When the grain is being cleaned does a drying operation take place at the same time, and is there anything taken off the price of the grain because of dockage and drying?

Mr. IRVINE: There is a process for drying at terminals. The charges for drying damp or tough grain are set. There is a problem arising from the drying of grain at a terminal elevator. For instance, at Churchill, the wheat board normally tries not to buy tough or damp grain for shipment into Churchill because the process of drying is comparatively slow and this restricts the flow of grain from the elevator to its destination.

Mr. MCINTOSH: I wonder whether anything has been done to reduce the number of grades we have in respect of Canadian standards here so as to comply with the export requirements? I understand we now have over 300 grades of grain. Has the commission done anything to reduce the number of grades?

Mr. IRVINE: Statutory grades are set by act of parliament. There are not very many of them, certainly nothing in the order of 300. There are a lot of off-grade grains which may, because of another factor, have a different grade. For instance, you could have a tough and lower grade of grain and a damp and lower grade and you could multiply this by a very large number. I do not think there have been any representations in respect of reducing the number of grades.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Qu'Appelle*): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we could discuss this grading situation after the report has been made? I know that a number of members desire to raise this question because it is a matter of some importance, and cannot be discussed thoroughly at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hamilton has suggested that our discussion in respect of grading should be deferred until after the report has been submitted. Does this committee agree?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to the next paragraph headed "Terminal Handlings".

Mr. MACLEOD: This subject is covered by the following statement:

Terminal Handlings

Both receipts and shipments at Fort William/Port Arthur terminals experienced a substantial decline during 1961-62. The amount of grain unloaded at lakehead elevators (250.6 millions) was some 75 million bushels less than the 1960-61 figure, while lake shipments (244.2 millions) were some 67 million bushels less than the volume recorded for the previous crop year. The actual bushelage volume of grain cargoes moving out of the Canadian lakehead by direct vessel to St. Lawrence ports at 110.5 million bushels indicated a decline of 4.5 millions from 1960-61 shipments but reflected an increased percentage (45% compared with 37% in 1960-61) going on a non-stop basis to the St. Lawrence ports. Direct overseas clearances from the Canadian lakehead declined somewhat from 16.2 million bushels in 1960-61 to 15.1 millions in the crop year under review. Shipments to U.S.A. lake