

with it is that that is not very much information to the party who is selling it. He is not selling the acres, he is selling the bushels.

*By Mr. McMaster:*

Q. It would strike me that if a voluntary Wheat Board got contracts for, let us say, 95 per cent of the acreage of Saskatchewan in wheat, they would know that they were going to control pretty nearly the whole crop of Saskatchewan, would they not?—A. If you had a voluntary Wheat Board, with 95 per cent signed up, then I would say that you would be getting very close, so far as selling is concerned, to a complete compulsory system in so far as selling is concerned.

Q. May I ask you one or two questions just arising out of that? Do you or do you not consider it necessary in order to have the beneficial effect that you claim for the proposed measure, do you or do you not require to control flour?—A. In regard to the first portion of your question, Mr. McMaster, I do not know that I have made any claims about the beneficial effects of this system by comparison with what they are doing now.

Q. Well, I will ask you that question directly? Do you consider it would be wise to have this proposed compulsory Wheat Board?—A. Well, sir, I have strictly avoided answering that question. We have been discussing the Wheat Board in relation to voluntary Pools. We would open up an entirely new field if we were going to discuss the Wheat Board in relation to existing conditions. I want to make that clear.

Q. Have you any objection to answering the question? It seems to me a very pertinent one.—A. I stated at the outset, sir, that representations so far as the organization with which I am concerned have already been made to this Committee by Mr. Robinson, representing the Canadian Council of Agriculture. This morning you have heard resolutions passed three successive years by the shareholders of our company asking for the re-instatement of the Wheat Board. I occupy a position as a servant of those gentlemen who want that service.

Q. I was thinking that you were here as a citizen of Canada?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To give us the advice that you could give us by reason of the special knowledge you had of this matter?—A. I am perfectly willing to do that. I have been trying to do that to the best of my ability all the morning.

Q. I am putting you up against this question; of course if you feel that it would be disloyal to the organization with which you are connected, to answer it, I am not going to insist.—A. Now, Mr. McMaster, that is the lawyer's way of putting it. The suggestion immediately in your remark is that I believe differently from them. I do not admit it.

Q. You neither admit it nor deny it?—A. No sir.

Mr. SALES: Mr. McMaster, that is not fair.

Mr. McMMASTER: I think it is very fair.

The CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. Sales, you will have to let Mr. McMaster deal with Mr. Riddell.

Mr. McMMASTER: I do not want to interfere. If Mr. Riddell does not want to give his personal views on this matter that we have been discussing now for about six weeks, I do not know whether or not the Chairman has the right to put him in a tower as a witness who won't answer questions. At one time a witness who refused to answer questions before a Parliamentary Committee was committed to the Tower.

The WITNESS: I am not so sure but what I would rather be there than here just now.

Mr. McMMASTER: I will try, Mr. Chairman, in my questions to avoid any expression or to infer any expression from the witness as to the advisability or the inadvisability of the proposed Wheat Board.