

it was reported on before, but the report was never concurred in. I am merely reminding you that it lies in your hands whether this Bill goes through or not or whether the Grain Standards Board is made the tribunal that will decide the matter. I will tell you candidly what that looks like to me: sending a matter back to the third court for the third time with an addition to it makes it worse and less representative of the Garnet interests seems to me an outrageous proposal altogether. I have never heard of such a thing in all my born days. You have all heard the old saying about laying a charge against His Satanic Majesty and then holding the court in hades. This system is very much like it—giving back to the same court that has already decided twice on it. I am not discussing the merits or demerits of Garnet wheat this morning. That is not my business. I have another meeting that is quite as important to me as Garnet wheat; but I am questioning very seriously this method and protesting very strongly against referring this question for the third time to the same tribunal, only worse.

Mr. HAMILTON: May I read from the statement which I already read. In this case it is not a matter of what I might have said offhand, but I prepared a memorandum and I am reading from that memorandum. It says, "To carry out the representations of the western committee on Grain Standards to the committee on Agriculture and Colonization the present Bill amending the Canada Grain Act has been submitted." To carry out the recommendation of the western committee to the committee on agriculture and colonization this Bill has been submitted.

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. The recommendation of this committee was never concurred in. It died on the table. It is of no more use than a dead chicken that was found dead on the roost next morning; it died on the roost; and the recommendation of this committee died on the roost, as dead as a doornail, and you want to resurrect it on this day; peradventure, it stinketh by this time. If we resurrect it we could restore it and put it through the House of Commons yet. No. Here is your recommendation, Mr. Hamilton. You read it yourself. It is dated the 8th of February, and the evidence is so unconvincing that it will make a laughing stock of this committee. It was bad enough before; it will be infinitely worse this time if you send it back to the Grain Standards Board for the third time after being made just a little worse—a less representative committee.

Now, that is what I submit to you in all fairness to the committee—not to the Liberals of this committee because that would be hopeless, there are so few of them, but to the Conservatives and every man in this committee no matter what he is politically. I appeal on the unfairness of this proposition of taking a tribunal of this kind. There are a lot of good men on it. I know a lot of them, but the man from the north is a Reward grower. I appeal to every man here not to put this committee for the third time in the position that you are going to do something that you cannot get through in the House of Commons. Let us do something that can be stood up to in the House of Commons and before the whole world, and not passed here and base some subsequent action on it, although the passing of it was never concurred in by the House of Commons and was never submitted in the House of Commons. That is my plea to you this morning. Later on we will deal with the Garnet question—the question of merits or demerits—but the procedure proposed by the Bill is as I described.

I had an interview with Mr. Stevens about a month ago, and I asked him: "Does that mean that you are referring this back to the Grain Standards Board?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Mr. Stevens, there is nobody on that Board representing the northern section of Saskatchewan, the north of the prairie prov-