

condition, some of it in a damp condition. The consequence was that the bulk of the wheat went into No. 3, and it went into a No. 3 which had been deliberately lowered by the alterations of the Act.

Now, those are matters to which I hope you will give special attention. I do not think we can go back to No. 3 as it used to be, but in the No. 3 under the definition which the law gives now it admits of certain other varieties of wheat being put into the No. 3 grade. I think that the lines should be drawn tighter in connection with that, and that a straight variety should rule the No. 3 exactly as it does in No. 1 and No. 2.

I wonder if I might, without offence, give an A.B.C. lesson in grading wheat? Nature, gentlemen, does not know anything about grades; nature does not produce wheat in grades at all. Grades of wheat are not like sizes in boots. Grades of wheat are made in this way: the perfect berry—or as near perfection as such things can be—is produced under certain conditions, and then there gradually appear defects in the berry and you allow the defects to go on down to a certain line, and when it gets there you say, "We will cut that off, and all above that line shall be No. 1." The same thing goes on and the defects increase until you get to another line, where you again cut it off any say that all above that line shall be No. 2. It goes on again with the defects increasing and you get to another line, and you cut it off and say that all above that line shall be No. 3. That is the philosophy of grading wheat, and it is upon those lines that the inspector acts when he grades the wheat sent from the farms. You say that all below the low line of No. 1 is No. 2 until you get to the low line of No. 2, and then all below that is No. 3 until you get to the low line of No. 3. That is how wheat grading goes on. I am not going into the question of mixing as that would take up too much time, but there should be a distinct integrity of variety in all our first three grades, No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3, so that our customers overseas buying either of those grades would know exactly what variety of wheat they were going to have.

We have a number of gentlemen in our western country who have become amateur experimenters in breeding wheat. It is being carried on at different places all over the west, and hybrid varieties are produced. It is generally known that wheat grows in sexes. There are male and female varieties. You can get crosses by using the pollen of the male variety with the female variety and it will produce a cross breed of wheat, generally known as a hybrid variety. We have quite a number of those in the west, and they are all detrimental to the essential qualities of western wheat. I wanted to say that to you. Now nobody understands this thing very much better than your own colleague and my old friend, Mr. John Millar. When we get beyond No. 3, we have not been accustomed to use the word "Northern." We do not say 4 Northern, or 5 Northern, or 6 Northern. Having got 1, 2, and 3, Northern, the other wheats have no statutory difference. But we have a body of men that are called together each season who examine the degree of imperfections that constitute a class of wheat nearest to No. 3, and that we call No. 4. And so they go on grading, not by definition. You cannot define it, Mr. Chairman, you grade it by appearance, and samples are sent out to all the buyers in the country to the effect that while 1 and 2 and 3 must be of a standard variety defined by statute, 4 and 5 and 6 and feed are not defined by statute at all, but are defined by the fiat of the Standards Board. I am quite correct, I think, Mr. Millar? Yes. Well now, I do not know what you can do. In the earlier days, with No. 1 and No. 2 and No. 3 Northern, we did not allow White Fife to be used. White Fife was a soft wheat and did not produce a standard quality of flour. Now, whether you can do anything by legislation, I do not know, to keep the undesirable varieties out

[Hon. George Langley.]