

flour made largely from Australian, Plates, Russians and all sorts of non-descript wheat with a small percentage of Manitobas to secure the necessary strength can be used. This is the sort of flour which English mills are producing and we are out to compete it by supplying the baker with a strong, pure, Manitoban flour essential to him in the "long process"—

And it may be pointed out that that has to do with the long and short baking processes mentioned here the other day. There is no question about it that the question of wheat enters into it—

—you can see therefore that it is the interest not only of ourselves but of all Canadian Wheat producers, indeed Canadian mills also, that there should be nothing which would cause the baker to waver in his determination to continue in his use of strong flour.

In other words, to continue the use of that class of wheat which will produce strong flour.

Mr. VALLANCE: May I ask the Minister to tell us whom that is from?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Yes, it is from Snodgrass. I am going to leave this committee to determine this matter and take the responsibility. As far as I am concerned, I want once again to try to leave the impression on the minds of the committee that I am not in my argument referring to the merits of this or that class of wheat, but it is our considered opinion that if we do not take some steps to grade Garnet separately and let it take its own position on its own merits, then I think you are prejudicing the high standing that Canadian hard wheat has had upon the markets of the world, and as far as I am concerned I shall not bear the responsibility of continuing that condition, because two years ago I was impressed with it. So I come to you now and say that as far as I am concerned this is my last word; the committee can make its own decision. There is no need of me sitting here. Mr. Fraser, the chief inspector, is here and Mr. Hamilton will be here, and those gentlemen can answer any technical question on the question of grading that you wish to ask as far as the Grain Commission is concerned. I cannot answer those questions any farther. I will leave the matter in your hands and the committee can deal with it as in its wisdom it sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stevens. I might say to the committee that it is unfortunate that the evidence of our last meeting is not yet in print. There was some delay, but it will be in your boxes sometime to-day. Now, Mr. Motherwell would like to make a statement.

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: I do not want to make a speech, but, like several other members, I am endeavouring at least to approach this matter with an open mind—that is, if it is possible to have an entirely open mind upon a subject that you have previously had almost a closed mind upon. Like the Minister who has just retired, busy, no doubt, as most of us are, I will not, I hope, engage in any controversial discussion. Conditions are too serious in our country for us to quarrel on these important matters. It would be far better for us to look for points upon which we can reach an agreement if possible, and this is one of them. This is a very important matter to a good many western farmers living in the northern portion of the prairie provinces particularly. This year alone, on the basis of the crop estimated by Mr. Fraser of 340,000,000 bushels, we would have something like 47,000,000 bushels of Garnet wheat to dispose of. That must affect a very large number of farmers. What I am going to deal with is not so much the merits or demerits of Garnet as a milling wheat as with the manner in which the Bill proposes to dispose of the question by passing it to the Grain Standards Board. That looks very much like passing the buck to George and letting him do it. Is not this too important a question to pass for the second time, if not the third time, back to the same tribunal?