

and conscientious, and I know they would give you all the advice that would be necessary.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. There is already a motion before the committee which we have not dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN: I was trying to get that motion in shape. Mr. Carmichael, I have drafted a motion hurriedly which will, perhaps, meet with your approval: Moved by Mr. Carmichael that a sub-committee of five members of this committee be appointed to decide upon the evidence to be asked for, having regard to the evidence given at the former investigation into this subject in 1932 by this committee.

Mr. GOBEL: Will that dispose of the business to-day, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not sure about that. Is that sufficiently definite, Mr. Carmichael?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Well, it is not as definite as I made it, but if it is understood by the committee that is what is desired, it is quite all right. I have in mind not only the evidence that was taken, but with a view to avoiding duplication.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish you would draft that yourself.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: There seems to be a feeling on the part of some members of the committee that we should hear evidence from the western men who are here now. If that is satisfactory to the committee, to hear the evidence from these men and go no farther in the taking of evidence, there is no object in putting this motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Are those gentlemen prepared to give evidence to-day, without any notice? I am perfectly agreeable.

Mr. GARLAND: The inference in Mr. Carmichael's remarks is to hear the grain experts of the grain trade, and then close the evidence.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GARLAND: I thought he suggested that if that is the only evidence taken, all right. I thought his point was made in an endeavour to try and break it off. I want to say if we are going to hear the grain trade, I am going to protest that this committee has a right to hear the evidence of the producers who are directly interested in growing Garnet wheat themselves.

Mr. LOUCKS: The whole thing we are concerned about has been repeated. We want to know whether this Garnet wheat is detrimental to the export of wheat. I think we have had evidence already to convince us that it is. On top of that, I don't for a minute feel like excluding those who have had experience, and those who have shipped, some of those from Winnipeg, who are here at this time and might give us evidence. I think this should be settled one way or another at this session right now. Two years ago we came here, and we had evidence then that convinced me that it was a detriment. I believe that the time is ripe, that we should do something in this session. It has been mentioned that if Garnet wheat cannot stand on its own merit, there must be something wrong with it; and if it can, we want to see the growers in the northern part have it. I am in between. I have got Garnet wheat in my own constituency. But at the same time if it is going to be, for instance, as evidence has been brought down here, detrimental in foreign imports, then I think it is time we have got to take steps, because we must pay attention to importers, those that want this wheat. I don't see why we should take time now as the session is coming to a close, to take evidence from all over western Canada. As far as that is concerned, I don't think we are going to work any hardship at all on the northern part of Saskatchewan or Alberta. From the information I am getting Reward wheat can well take the place of this Garnet wheat. There