

established and separated in order that you will have the actual experience, and have something upon which to base the spreads rather than have, as Mr. Motherwell said, spreads set arbitrarily.

*By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:*

Q. There were train loads of Garnet hauled up to the Hudsons Bay, and we all commended you and the Wheat Pool for that, and I do not know what would have happened the exports via that route if you had not done that, but inasmuch as it was almost solid Garnet—I think it shows about 60 per cent average but a lot of it was more than that—did you trace up these shipments to the ultimate miller to see how they panned out, or did you get any word from them at all?—A. Mr. Chairman, we have some information. I would much prefer to answer Mr. Motherwell's question later, more particularly because we still have considerable stocks in store in the government elevator at Churchill, and anything I might say at the moment regarding the matter would not be an answer to the question.

Q. I did not know there was anything delicate about it, but I had made inquiries several times before and there was never any complaint?—A. I am not quite prepared to answer the question.

Mr. GARLAND: I am just asking Mr. Brouillette the question, if he does not think that the whole of the evidence so far before this committee would indicate that the grower of Garnet is going to have to take a terrific loss the moment separate grading takes place.

The WITNESS: I am not familiar with the evidence that has been submitted, Mr. Chairman, but in so far as I have gathered information from those who have made a study of the question, and men who are qualified to speak with a certain degree of authority, it does not boost Garnet. However, the reason I suggest large commercial shipments is for the very reason that you now bring out, Mr. Garland, that it would not be guess work in setting spreads as to relative values.

*By Mr. Garland:*

Q. If the loss is going to be so great, would it not be the part of wisdom that this committee should undertake to recommend the abolition of the growing of Garnet at some set date ahead rather than now penalize the grower who has his grain in the ground?—A. I would not suggest that.

Q. Now, would it not be the part of wisdom that this committee should recommend the abolition of the grading of Garnet at some set date ahead rather than penalize the grower who has his grain in the ground now?—A. Mr. Chairman, I am not too sure that in setting up separate grades for Garnet you are really mistreating the Garnet Producer, because if the purchaser would prefer having Garnet in its purity and not mixed with other grains, for reasons that he well knows it may be to the advantage of the Garnet producers to enable the buyers to buy Garnet as they would have it.

Q. Now, that is the point I want to get at. Can Mr. Brouillette give this committee any assurance that there is any reasonable market for Garnet in a pure condition?—A. I cannot.

Q. Nor can anybody else?—A. I would say that if it should develop that there is not a market for Garnet in its purity that is the reason why, and a stronger argument why its production should not be encouraged at the expense of other varieties that are wanted.

Q. I am not taking exception to that, but to the method by which we shall reach that point. That is the question that is now under consideration. Do you not think it would be better, in view of all the evidence against Garnet, that we should set a date, say, one year from now, prohibiting the growing of