

ing to the statements that have been made to us here, the last time we met and to-day, we are prejudicing our chance in the world market by allowing to continue what we have allowed for the past two years. I have not got any evidence here in regard to these price spreads between Fort William and Vancouver on No. 2 Northern, but I would like to point this out: during the last two years the price of No. 1 Hard has increased over the price of No. 1 Northern, all the way from 2 to 5 and 6 cents a bushel. This morning the spread between No. 1 Hard and No. 2 Northern is 4 cents a bushel. Now, a matter of some three or four years ago, No. 1 Hard and No. 1 Northern were the same price. Now, I cannot give you any technical evidence in regard to that, but there is a lurking suspicion in my mind that the present unsatisfactory condition of No. 2 Northern has something to do with that and we have displaced the No. 1 Hard, which is now equivalent to what it used to be, No. 1 Northern, and we have now a No. 1 Northern which is equivalent to what used to be No. 2.

Mr. FRASER: Might I point out that there is no Garnet in No. 1 Northern; your Garnet would not come into that picture.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Perhaps our No. 1 Hard and our No. 1 Northern are developing into the grade that used to be No. 2 Hard and No. 1 Northern.

Mr. VALLANCE: Are you saying that that question is correct, Mr. Fraser?

Mr. FRASER: I would say that that was not a fact.

The CHAIRMAN: Has Mr. Carmichael finished his statement?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I was just raising that question, that is something which has developed within the last two or three years; and the reason that we put through amendments to the Canada Grain Act here during the last few years was because there was no spread between No. 1 Hard and No. 1 Northern, and some of us thought we ought to have a different grade. The spread this morning is 4 cents. That is something worth remembering. It is up to this committee to settle the question, and we should settle it at this session of parliament; and I do not see any virtue in calling witnesses before us to state what we had two years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the next member speaks, may I just say that there are a number of copies of the Minutes of Evidence taken two years ago on the table here—the first five hearings, with the evidence submitted by Mr. Ramsay, the then Commissioner; Dr. Newman, of the Department of Agriculture; Dr. Tory, of the National Research Council; Dr. Newton, of the University of Alberta; and Mr. Fraser. These copies are available for members of the Committee who may desire to look into them. It seems to me that it would be wise, in any case, not to go over the evidence of what was submitted before again, and to confine our activities to new evidence as to what has developed between the time of the last hearing and the present.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Fraser, I think, wants to make a statement now.

Mr. FRASER: That is, with respect to No. 1 Hard being of the same weight as our No. 1 Northern is today. Our No. 1 Hard today is considerably better than our No. 1 Northern has ever been. The reason why we have had No. 1 wheat during the last three or four years is on account, I believe, of the dry season, where our wheat has grown harder and stronger and redder than it was during the season when they had a lot of rain. Our No. 1 Hard today is getting the same reception on world markets that it has always had in previous years. Our No. 1 Northern today I consider is still No. 1 Northern.

Mr. VALLANCE: It is still statutory?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: But it will be influenced by the other in producing the same kind of wheat, on account of the drought.