

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: Was that in 1932?

Hon. Mr. WEIR: Yes, this is in 1932. I am not saying for an instant that it cannot be explained, why there was a narrower spread at Vancouver even with a preponderance of Garnet than there was at Fort William; but if it can be explained, surely the committee is entitled to the explanation.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. WEIR: Now, the second way in which we can test the discrimination is this: it is stated that millers are discriminating against our wheat on account of Garnet being in No. 2. How will they show their discrimination, besides the spread? It will be by their buying wheat from other exporting countries. And that will be shown by the extent to which they are willing to pay exporting countries a higher price, as compared to what they pay for Canadian wheat, and than they did before Garnet was in our Canadian wheat. I think that is also a fair statement. Now, I believe that the Board of Grain Commissioners should be in a position, in conjunction with the trade which sells our wheat, to state whether that is the case or not; that is, whether the millers are discriminating against our wheat to the extent that they are willing to go out and pay a higher price for other wheat than they did in the past.

There is another method by which we can test this: the millers state that they do not want our No. 2 wheat; our own millers, and some millers of the United Kingdom; because of the Garnet in it. Can we find this out exactly, by getting sworn statements from the millers and from the trade as to just how much No. 2 wheat they are buying now in comparison with what they did buy.

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. WEIR: I am making this statement because all we want is the facts before us to enable us to decide whether there is discrimination against it or not.

I have another note: can the grain commissioners not tell us the complaints against our wheat during the last year; are there any complaints against No. 1—the point is raised, and the information seeps through to the farmers. My understanding was that of the 12 or 15 objections raised before the Western Grain Standards Board, all were against our No. 1 being too starchy in its kernels; and if that is true, that will account for the narrower spread between No. 1 and No. 2.

The next point I want to make, and I am through, is this: As I stated, we should have this definite information; because I believe that dollars and cents are the things that really tell with reference to wheat. Now, I have read a statement this morning by Dr. Newton, of the Research Council; and I think from the nature of his statement that he must have given it serious consideration, and he should be asked to come here and give us the benefit of what he has learned. Here is his statement, made in Winnipeg before the Board of Trade no later than April 6th of this year:

And the wheat that is still grown in the North should consist of good quality variety, like Reward, and not of the fatally attractive, sadly deceptive Garnet.

Now, that is a very strong statement; and if it is a true statement it is only fair to the farmers in the north of Saskatchewan and Alberta to know on what definite finite evidence that is based.

I would suggest that this committee meet in a week or ten days from now, giving the Board of Grain Commissioners ample opportunity to provide answers to these difficulties that confront us; and perhaps at that time we could decide, or today if it is in your judgment, whether a sub-committee should be set up of western members.