

large extent. The farmers in the district from which I have the honour to come are, I believe, strongly opposed to this measure. S. Herrold & Son, of Brantford, who are well known to the Minister of Customs and who are not political friends of mine write me a very strong letter in which they inform me that the farmers in that district are dead against the Bill; that they are unalterably opposed to this Bill. I have letters from Mr. Bruce, who formerly sat in this House, from Mr. Ewing, of Montreal, from Mr. Hogg, of Oakwood, from Mr. Steele, of Toronto, from Mr. Keith, of Toronto, and others who stand high in the trade, every one testifying that they do not think the Bill practicable and workable. These men have spent their lives in the business and are thoroughly familiar with the requirements of the trade and of agriculture, and I maintain that if the minister persists in forcing this Bill through the House it will either drive out from the trade the men legitimately entitled to stay there or it will become a dead letter on our statute-book. Both of these results are undesirable and the minister cannot wish for either of them to come to pass. I ask then that in fairness to all concerned, this Bill should be submitted to a committee where persons, documents, and evidence may be adduced to show the various features of the Bill that are impracticable and unworkable or wherein it fails to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman who has introduced it. If this is done, I think we will secure a practicable and workable measure, and I again suggest to him that he should read carefully the evidence taken by that British committee of which I have spoken which was appointed to deal with this very subject. The members of that committee travelled from end to end of the British Isles, took the evidence of all parties concerned and of every one interested in seeds and after having deliberated and taken evidence under oath they submitted that in their opinion it was not desirable that government control should be introduced. If this is the case in Great Britain and they are the best judges of seed in the world to-day,—we have no men in this country who can equal them—I submit that the hon. gentleman should take a leaf out of the book of the British government and appoint a committee to deal with this matter, a committee who will thresh out every clause of the Bill. I wish to point out one of the amendments which the hon. gentleman put in with regard to the labelling of screenings which he allows to be held for export, whereas a large number of better seeds between screenings and No. 1 are not allowed to be held for export. Therefore a man must either not hold these seeds or label good seeds as screenings. Surely he does not want to insist on trying to carry out so unreasonable a provision as that. The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Bor-

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

den) pointed out when this amendment was introduced that it bordered very close on nonsense and so it does. The minister allows the lowest grade to be held as screenings if for export, but the many intervening grades between screenings and No. 1 he refuses to allow to be held. Surely in view of this the minister will not insist on passing the measure through the House. It is very ill-considered, there is no hurry about the Bill, and I submit that it is far better to have a delay of two or three weeks and have a practicable working measure that can be carried out than to come to this House and insist without due consideration on the passing of this measure. I am sure that 50 per cent of the members could not hear the hon. gentleman yesterday when the amendments were introduced. We were asked to vote these amendments blindly and to take the whole dose down at once. It is surely not in the interests of enlightened legislation, not in accordance with the wishes of the members of the House of Commons of Canada, that we should endorse a Bill that contains so many imperfections; there are as many imperfections in it as there are in the seeds which the hon. gentleman describes. Twenty-five varieties of weeds may be in the seeds and I am sure there are more than 25 imperfections in this Bill that might be easily remedied by reference to a committee. I have pleasure in moving that this Bill be not now read a third time but be referred to a committee.

Mr. FISHER. Before you put the question, I would like to say in reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that this whole question has been threshed out. I think that everything the hon. member has said has been said in the House by himself perhaps more than once. The hon. gentleman asks that the Bill be referred to a special committee, but the Bill has been through a general committee, through the Committee of the Whole House, and I do not think any better committee could possibly be struck to consider it any further. The Bill has been before the House not in every detail as it is now, but in principle, for the last three sessions. There is no question of precipitancy, there is no question of hastiness, there is no question of lack of consideration. The hon. gentleman himself and other gentlemen on both sides of the House have discussed every detail of this Bill over and over again. Every detail has been discussed in committee and now the Bill is up for its third reading. I cannot see any utility in delaying the passage of the Bill or referring it back to any special committee for any particular object. I can therefore only ask the House to reject the amendment of the hon. member and ask that the Bill be read a third time and be sent up to the Senate.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to say more than a few words, although I regard this as