

Mr. DUPUIS: We are all interested in the remark made by the ex-minister of Agriculture and the present minister of Agriculture. As an eastern member I am very much interested in these questions, but my interest is rather academic than practical. And moreover I believe that this committee has so many questions of general interest to be studied that it would be preferable that this question of Garnet wheat be referred to a sub-committee. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Smith: that a sub-committee, to be composed of all the members of the three western central provinces be appointed to study this question and report back to this committee upon it.

Mr. MYERS: Mr. Chairman, before the motion is put to the committee I believe I have a better idea than that. I believe, as the minister has stated, that the real factor which determines the issue in a case like this is dollars and cents. In view of the price spreads which the minister has given us I would feel like leaving this question exactly where it is for another year at least, and then we would have a chance to see how the dollars and cents side of it works out.

Mr. TUMMON: Mr. Chairman, being one of the Eastern members I do not pretend to know a great deal about the wheat situation. There are a few things that I cannot just reconcile in my mind. In the first place, take for example the spread. I can perhaps understand the situation where the millers, having a certain amount of No. 1—probably there would be more No. 1 than there would be of No. 2—but they would have to have a certain amount of No. 2 to mix with No. 1. The result might easily be that the spread between No. 1 and No. 2, would be limited to a very small amount; on the other hand there is another question that has been going through my mind, and that is, if Garnet wheat is as good as those who claim it is, what fear should there be to grading it. As far as I am concerned I want to get the facts all together and I want to vote intelligently, and I cannot vote intelligently until I hear some of the evidence. And I think that, even like Mr. Vallance, I do not believe that the Minister should come here and take the stand that you should do this and you should do that, after hearing the evidence. My opinion is that we should follow the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture and through calling witnesses here—all the other committees are calling witnesses, and it costs money—this is just as important a committee as any committee of the House; let us do likewise. Let us get the facts and then be in a position to settle this question one way or the other.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I think we are forgetting that two years ago we put in day after day in this very committee listening to evidence in connection with this very subject. I was just looking in my drawer up there this morning, and I still have a stack of the minutes of evidence given before this agricultural committee on the subject of the grading of Garnet wheat. Well now, two years afterwards do we need to go through the same process again?

Mr. DAVIES: You might find part of that evidence so out of date as to be misleading.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I do not know whether that evidence is wrong or not. Personally, I do not see that there is anything to be gained by referring back to the procedure we took three years ago. Nor, Mr. Chairman, do I say that it is a proper procedure to refer this to a western committee. While the western committee might decide it on its merits as they see the question, I think the members of Eastern Canada are interested in this question too. It is not a matter of the grower of Marquis getting a little more for his No. 2 or a grower of Garnet getting a little more for his No. 2; it is a matter of protecting the reputation of Canada in world markets, or the wheat that she exports, in face of the fact that 14 per cent of the production is Garnet wheat and 86 per cent of the production is Marquis, Reward, Renfrew, or some other variety. Accord-