

that a great deal of publicity was given this matter two years ago that that was to be done for this past crop year, do you think it is working an undue hardship on the grower of Garnet wheat if this bill should be adopted now and put into effect?—A. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Carmichael, there has been a lot of talk about this and you really have not done it. Now, the grower gets accustomed to having a lot of talk going on about this and they are probably risking it again that it will be talk again and that it will not be done this year. Now, then, he has gone ahead and seeded. At the best he would not have had a sufficient notice to take advantage of all these things that intervened in the interim.

Hon. Mr. WEIR: The fact that the Standards Board did not act on our recommendation would be a pretty good indication to the farmers that it was not as important as the committee recommended.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: As a matter of fact, this report was never adopted by the House.

The WITNESS: That is what I was going to say.

*By Mr. Carmichael:*

Q. Just follow that a little further. If this bill should be adopted by the committee, and reported upon favourably in the House, and Garnet wheat were excluded from 2 Northern, it would still be eligible to go into number 3?—A. Yes, but do you want to do that? Is that fair to Garnet?

Q. Now, that is just the question which the committee will have to decide. There is another point upon which you might give us some information. In view of the fact that the producer of Garnet will get possibly twice the volume per acre in yield that the grower of Marquis will get out on the open prairie, do you think that even from that viewpoint the producer of Garnet would be unduly discriminated against?—A. On the first question. Does that mean that by excluding Garnet you are going to stop at 2 Northern? That would hardly be fair.

Q. According to the bill that is what is proposed?—A. Yes, but coupled with that has been the idea of setting grades for it, has it not?

Q. That may eventually come, but not according to the present bill?—A. Otherwise you would be unloading the whole of it into number 3.

Mr. BROWN: I do not think there is any serious thought in adopting this bill that Garnet should be relegated to number 3. Now, with regard to giving notice, I think this committee took a reasonable view two years ago when they recognized it was only fair to give notice, and this present committee is willing to be just as fair to-day. I am quite satisfied that there will be no proposition from this committee that its action should be applied to this year's crop.

Mr. BROWN: We would not think of any such thing.

*By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:*

Q. Did you ever know of any wheat which was graded separately from northern wheats, Manitoba northern wheats—did you ever know of any variety being graded separately and surviving, except possibly Durum which is not a milling wheat?—A. I doubt, Mr. Motherwell—you would remember farther back on that than I would. I do not think so.

Q. There was White Fife, Kota, and there was what they called Quality—White wheat—they all died on the roost and died inside of a few years. Quality wheat had a great run for a while, and now you only see one or two cars. Mr. Fraser will correct me in that.

Mr. FRASER: Yes, that is all.