

a sub-committee composed of western members of this committee be appointed to deal with the question and report back. Now, might I point out to the Committee, of course, that any report which is made by the sub-committee will have to be adopted by the main committee before the report can be made to the House; so that every member in the committee will be responsible to a certain extent, and have their share of responsibility in supporting the action taken. I am going to leave it at that, just to show you what the position is; and it is for the committee to decide.

Mr. TUMMON: Mr. Chairman, when I made the suggestion that I did, I had no idea of going back and rehashing the evidence given two years ago. My idea was that we should bring that evidence up to date. The evidence that was given two years ago, in a great many cases, may be completely out of date to-day. I really think that the question as to whether or not evidence is to be taken, to a limited extent, should be decided before the motion that is now before the committee, and should be voted on. If the evidence is going to be taken, I would feel disposed to having the evidence given before the entire agriculture committee.

Mr. BOYES: As a member from eastern Canada, and one possibly not so very much interested in Garnet wheat—not to any extent other than the reputation of the wheat as a whole for the Dominion of Canada—I feel that in having this referred to a sub-committee possibly will not expedite matters very much. As it has to come back to this committee anyway, it may be wise that we continue as we are, and take evidence such as our Chairman has suggested, that is new evidence to what we took two years ago; not have that repeated, but call new evidence, and take it before this committee as a whole as we have it at the present time, and not have a sub-committee.

Mr. LOUCKS: I don't want to take much time of the committee. I agree with the former speaker. I don't believe we should split up the committee. I am from western Canada, and I think that we should hear the evidence that is submitted here as to the merits of this wheat. I think we pretty well agree, because the responsibility has to come back to the whole committee, after all, and I think it would be a waste of time to split it up.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the motion, gentlemen? You have heard the motion which is that a sub-committee of western members be appointed to deal with this question. All in favour? Contrary? I declare the motion lost.

I think the next thing to do would be to decide whether you want witnesses; and if so, it would be wise, possibly, to appoint a sub-committee to deal with the question of witnesses.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Just on that question, briefly—I have no objection to hearing anything additional of developments in the past two years, but it would be necessary for us to know very definitely what we heard two years ago, and then decide what new points are going to be brought out that will be helpful to us. I think if you delve into that, you will find there is very little, except on those price spreads that Mr. Weir (*Melfort*) has mentioned. I think you will find very little that we didn't get two years ago that will be helpful to us.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid it is hopeless to deal with that question as a whole committee. Don't you think a sub-committee should look into that, and perhaps this committee instruct them not to ask for evidence to be repeated? I am only suggesting that in an attempt to facilitate the work of the committee.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I think, Mr. Chairman, we would be proceeding in a more orderly manner if you had a sub-committee decide on what points evidence should be secured before there is any sub-committee appointed to decide on calling any witnesses. If we decide to call any witnesses, we will just start following the same trail as we did two years ago. I would make a motion that