

I was desirous of pointing out that various amendments have been made to this Bill since it came before the House. Some of these we have been able to comprehend, others we have not. I must say that it remains in a very unsatisfactory state now, in so far as I have been able to gather the opinion of the House on the matter. The hon. Minister of Agriculture yesterday, for some reason or other, was in very poor voice for him. We could not very well hear what he said, and therefore we were unable to take that part in the debate which we should like to have taken. Therefore, I feel called upon to move this amendment which I have just offered to the House. In the first place, I desire to point out that the time mentioned in clause 1 is too limited. That I have previously drawn attention to, and it is not necessary to give further reasons than simply to say that this is a serious objection to the Bill. Then clause 3, providing for the placarding of the sacks, is also a most objectionable one. The hon. gentleman has had pointed out to him time and again that it was impossible to carry out this provision of the Bill, but he refuses to take any notice of that objection, which, all the trade will tell him, is absolutely well-founded. It is impossible to placard these bags even if we were willing, because if the seed should contain any of these weeds which are enumerated, it is necessary to placard the bag with the names of these weeds. It is impossible to do that. Further, seed for the foreign market would not be accepted in bags placarded in this way, and for that reason I desire again to point out to the hon. minister that it is impossible that this provision can be carried out. Then as to the exemption of the grower while the dealer is prohibited from selling this article, I desire again to point out that there are serious objections to this provision. The hon. minister announced that his object in bringing in this Bill was to ensure the purity of seed, but it turns out, in view of this provision of the Bill, that it is not for pure seed at all. If that were the object of the Bill, that clause should not stand for a moment. That particular clause cannot stand the test of good judgment at the hands of this House; therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should recall that clause. Then in regard to the standard for seed that he sets up. I have submitted, and I am sure it has not been controverted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, nor can it well be, that it is impossible to comply with the provisions of clause 4, I think it is. It is impossible for us to get a large amount of seed of No. 1 quality. No. 1 quality will be a very scarce article according to the Bill. The Bill makes it difficult to procure No. 1 quality, but when you have procured that quality you have not a first-class seed by any means. That, I think, is a very serious objection to the Bill. The hon. minister sets up a standard for No. 1 quality, and after he has

obtained that quality, according to the test of purity which he makes, he has a very inferior quality of seed, as he takes no stock in the colour of the seed nor in the size of its development. These are two very important factors in seed which the hon. gentleman discards entirely. The evidence taken by the Royal Commission that inquired into the matter in England discloses the fact that two of the prime necessities of No. 1 seed are that it shall be of large well developed size and have a good bold colour. Both of these items are absent in the hon. minister's estimate of No. 1 seed. There is another very good reason why the clause setting up a standard for No. 1 seed should meet with the opposition of the House. The requirements of the clause are such that only a limited quantity will pass the tests, and will not be the best of seed by any means. But it must be placarded nevertheless as inferior if it contains five out of a thousand weed seeds. That is surely a great injustice to a large amount of the product of this country, because having to be placarded it makes it comparatively unsaleable. It is placed at a discount on the market, because you have branded upon it all the various impurities which it contains, though they may be very limited in quantity.

It is quite possible under this Bill that these weed seeds may prevail to the extent of 10, 15 or 20 to the thousand, and still you will have a very much better article than you would have with a sample that is poor in germination, but true to name and which at the same time may have only five weed seeds to the thousand. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has missed the object of the measure entirely in setting up his standard. He has not got a good standard for No. 1 seed after having graded it according to this Bill. For this and for various other reasons that have already been adduced in the House, and that are convincing to the judgment of all men who desire to have a good practicable and workable measure, I believe that this Bill should be submitted to a special committee where the evidence of those well qualified to judge can be obtained and the matter can be fully threshed out before a committee of farmers, growers, dealers and all concerned. Let every clause stand on its merits and if it is found that the Bill will pass before this committee and is believed to be a workable and practical measure which will serve the best interests of agriculture in this country by all means let us pass the Bill. But if it is not found to be such a Bill as will pass the ordeal of a committee, either the Committee of Agriculture or a special committee to be named by the Prime Minister, then I think the hon. gentleman should introduce into it such amendments as will make it a satisfactory measure. I am sure that he has misgauged the feeling of the country to a