

the Chairman appoint a sub-committee to decide what points of evidence should now be obtained which we did not have two years ago.

Mr. VALLANCE: On that point, might I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to do that, there is only one point. That point is as to whether this wheat should be segregated and graded by itself or not. That is the point. As to how you are going to get the information, to arrive at the conclusion as to whether it should or not, is the next point. But that is the question at issue, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SWANSTON: Who are in a better position to decide that question than the western members?

Mr. VALLANCE: It is not for me to say; but I know that when we were revising the Grain Act—and I leave it to the two eastern members who sat in; we were very pleased to have them sit in—the whole responsibility did fall upon the western members, and I think we did a good job of the revision of the Grain Act. While it is very nice to have the eastern members sit in here with us and discuss this question—it is an education to them—I suggest that now they are going to have it before this entire committee, that they see they attend it; and let us sit a little more regularly than we have been doing. It is possible for the western members to sit every other day.

Mr. DAVIES: I will second Mr. Carmichael's motion.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard Mr. Carmichael's motion, is there any discussion? The motion was that a committee be appointed of say five, Mr. Carmichael, would you say?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Three or five.

The CHAIRMAN: That a committee of three or five be appointed to decide upon the additional evidence to be submitted to this committee.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Additional evidence which will not cover the field which was covered two years ago.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not willing to second that. That was not the original motion.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Yes. The point I wanted to make was that there is no need of covering again, in the taking of evidence, what was covered here two years ago. If there is additional evidence to be brought before the committee which has developed within the past two years, certainly we should take it. The point I had in mind was that a committee of three or five members could decide what points should be brought before this committee which would give us information we have not now got.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think anyone who is familiar with the question knows that the condition is the same as it was two years ago. This evidence you have now, that you took two years ago, is enough for you to base your conclusions on right now. There is nothing that you can bring in now dealing with Garnet wheat that you didn't get two years ago. The farmer is just in the same position.

Mr. PERLEY: Other than the matter of spreads. I would suggest this: We have one of the largest exporters of grain from western Canada sitting right here in this room to-day, Mr. Sidney Smith of Winnipeg. I would move that he be called, may be not to-day, but if you are calling other witnesses with respect to spreads, I move that he be called.

Mr. MULLINS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the last speaker. There are two or three practical men here who are connected with the grain business in Winnipeg, to my own knowledge, and I don't see why you can't get all the information that is necessary to decide the question that you have before the committee now. They are traders in grain, and they know; they are honest