

wheat industry. Give the buyer what he wants and we shall go a long way to re-establish our, until recently, high reputation for wheat throughout all importing countries.

Yours very truly,

W. L. WIELAND.

Mr. BROWN: What is the effect of that cable?

The CHAIRMAN: The writer quotes the cable he received in reply to the question asked at our last meeting in this committee.

Mr. BROWN: Would you read the cable again?

The CHAIRMAN: "Garnet hard brittle impossible condition milling when mixed with Marquis much better chance mill to advantage when dealt with separately."

Another matter which we have to deal with before we hear witnesses this morning is that Dr. Tory is ready to come before us at any time, and we should like to have him to-morrow if possible.

(Discussion followed.)

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we have two witnesses to be heard to-day—John S. Fisher who is head of the Scottish Co-operative Organization of Winnipeg and Mr. Brouillette, the head of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. We will hear Mr. Fisher first.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Chairman, before your witness is called, I would like to say a word or two with reference to the letter that was filed this morning, because, I presume, we are not dismissing this matter in so summary a fashion. I would like the opportunity as a member of this committee to examine somebody who has some knowledge of the basis of that letter. One would not think of a letter being addressed to a judge of a court being accepted as a statement of fact without some opportunity being given for examination of such a statement, and I would like that opportunity personally—and perhaps some other members of the committee would also—to examine some representative of the C. W. S. Limited who has some knowledge of the matters stated in that letter. This matter is not nearly so well defined or so well settled as Mr. Loucks and some other members of the committee think. I have before me the report of the committee for 1932, and I will read from pages 66 and 67 portions of a letter dated April 1, 1932, from Mr. James Sword, of the Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society Limited, Glasgow, addressed to Dr. Newman, Dominion Cerealists. It is quite a lengthy letter and, therefore, I shall read only parts of it. He is complaining about our number 2 grade:

On the primary cause I am not prepared to be so dogmatic, but I have very strong suspicions, and tolerably good reasons for concluding, that the trouble begins with the inclusion of certain wheat varieties in number 2 grade which are excluded from number 1.

Later on he says:

It is quite possible that all these results and defects may have no connection with Garnet wheat."

This was from an authoritative purchaser written 1st of April, 1932, and I presume there are some on this committee who hold the view that irrespective of the wheat, grain grown in northern parts is low in protein content, and it may be that whether it happens to be Garnet, Reward or any other wheat you will still have some defect in number 2 as long as you grow wheat in northern parts. The separation of Garnet may not overcome these defects.

It is also a rather significant thing to point out that since this evidence was given before the committee in 1932 the United Kingdom in the crop year 1932-33 imported from this country the largest quantity of wheat in the history of the