

Now, those are the facts. Dr. Newman will substantiate them when he gives his evidence. I am speaking largely from memory, but I know it just the same, and I know that is right. This is the Board which with evidence on only one side, and what they happened to know themselves, pronounced on this Garnet wheat question without hearing the evidence of the other side. Now, then, the same jury is there with one exception, the same Standards Board is there, and if my memory serves me aright—I will be subject to correction—this matter has been referred to them twice already. It was referred to the Grain Standards Board in 1932.

MR. HAMILTON: That is correct. After Mr. Ramsay returned from the Old Country it was again sent to the Grain Standards Board.

HON. MR. MOTHERWELL: Then, in order to make the Grain Standards Board more representative, apparently two gentlemen whose names were mentioned here the other day, Mr. Canfield and Mr. Bennett, were put on the Standards Board recently—possibly since the last meeting of this committee on the subject, 1932.

MR. HAMILTON: Just after that.

HON. MR. MOTHERWELL: Apparently that was to give the Garnet area representation. But what kind of representation did it give Garnet wheat? Mr. Canfield is a grower of Reward wheat and a member of the Seed Growers' Association and a competitor against Garnet, not a representative of Garnet. That gentleman is put on the Standards Board with the idea of giving a more representative and a fairer jury. Not satisfied with referring this question to the same court twice, the proposed Bill is to send it to the same jury a third time. Now, we have some legal men in this committee, and we are always glad to have legal men in the Agriculture Committee, and those gentlemen know that if you have an appeal from one court to another court you would not send it back to the same court with only additional evidence which is worse rather than better. What would you think of that practice? Yet that is what is proposed in this Bill. I might say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has not thought it out very well. Now, Mr. Hamilton and I have been friends since boyhood. I played ball with him when he was in his knickerbockers. He is one of my personal friends. Indeed, some people are so unkind as to say that maybe I had something to do with his appointment. But let that go. I still feel kindly towards him, and I am not going to speak on any personal grounds. I would rather save him than criticize anything he has said. But that is what they did with the Standards Board—not the second time, but the third time.

MR. HAMILTON: May I try to correct you on that. It is not proposed to refer to the western committee on Grain Standards the question as to whether Garnet wheat should be graded separately or not unless this committee should decide to do so. That is not the proposal in the Bill. It is proposed to refer to the committee the question of setting up grades, not as to whether Garnet wheat shall be graded separately or not but to decide whether there shall be one grade, two grades or three grades.

HON. MR. MOTHERWELL: Of what? Garnet?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, of Garnet; and what the specifications of these grades would be.

HON. MR. MOTHERWELL: That is surely splitting hairs. That is the court we have to deal with. Mr. Stevens says he is going to wash his hands of it altogether. He has when he sends it to the Standards Board.

MR. LUCAS: Is it not for this committee to decide that point?

HON. MR. MOTHERWELL: Surely. This committee has to do with this Bill. If we say it goes through, of course it is this committee; but the question of the separate grading of Garnet wheat was before this committee before and