

is no objection at all. From any evidence we have, Reward is a favourable wheat in any place in Europe. Two years ago warning was given. We have had two years. The Garnet wheat growers have had two years, and surely they should begin now to put themselves in a position whereby they may possibly adopt this Reward wheat instead of Garnet. I would like to see this thing brought to a head.

Hon. Mr. WEIR (*Melfort*): There is a point there that Mr. Loucks has mentioned, that there must be something wrong about Garnet wheat if it is afraid to stand on its own. There is just one point there. Garnet wheat may not in any way be detrimental to No. 2. It may be just as good wheat. What would be the effect of segregating it, as a separate wheat, in the minds of people that have been buying it for some time? I feel this way, that this sub-committee should get seriously to work and decide what points we want cleared up, and clear them up from every side; and notify witnesses before they come what information we want them to bring. I feel we should do this so that we can give the farmers indisputable reasons why we should take the steps we take, why we do put Garnet wheat in a separate grade; or if we cannot, then allow it is to continue. I do think, when thousands of farmers are affected to the extent that they will be affected, that the least we can do is for the sub-committee to seriously investigate the evidence we do need, and notify the people that we summon as to the evidence we want them to bring; and then decide it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: With regard to this motion I had in mind, possibly it would still be acceptable that a sub-committee of five members be appointed to decide what additional points of evidence should be brought before this committee, which were not given us two years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory? Who is your seconder?

Mr. DAVIES: I was the seconder. It is quite satisfactory to me as long as it is understood that would not exclude the evidence that follows that evidence given before, on the spreads.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be new evidence. Are you ready for the motion?

Mr. TUMMON: Does the motion mean, if carried, that the sub-committee, after they have decided on them, go on and summon witnesses? Or do they report back to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: If you don't mind, we will settle this motion first. Are you ready for the motion, gentlemen?

Mr. TUMMON: I think my question should be settled before the motion is put. I asked if the motion that Mr. Carmichael has made would mean that that sub-committee would first decide on the points, and then report back to this committee for adoption.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Yes.

Mr. TUMMON: That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is understood, then. All in favour of the motion, please signify.

Carried.

Then I suggest the names of Mr. Carmichael, Mr. Loucks, Mr. Perley, Mr. Vallance and Mr. Weir (*Melfort*). Are those names satisfactory? I was thinking that perhaps a little larger representation might be better on that committee, if they are to decide on the witnesses.

Mr. VALLANCE: Might I make a suggestion? You have three Saskatchewan men. I would suggest putting an Alberta man in my place. It would be quite agreeable to have Percy Davies.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would suggest having Mr. Davies on that committee.