

way to amending the section and reduced the penalty so that the maximum in each case will not exceed \$25. This is a large penalty and it is for a new offence, an offence which might arise without any intentional wrong on the part of the person who is to be fined. The Bill provides that this fine may be imposed not only upon the owner but upon any person who is in possession for the time being of the seed. It may be a railway company, a common carrier, it may be any person on whose premises the goods are temporarily deposited or housed and it may be even a person who is driving a load of grain to market. If an officer comes up and insists upon making an examination and if this person refuses or obstructs in any degree he is liable to a fine of \$500 if the magistrate sees fit to inflict a fine to that extent. This is, as the hon. minister said the other day, to some extent, an experimental matter. This is a matter of educating the people up to a certain standard and it is not advisable that we should have drastic legislation at the beginning. Would it not be manifestly unfair if a railway company which was carrying this grain from place to place, refused in such case to stop its train in order to permit of the examination here spoken of being made? Yet the result would be that if a railway company refused to delay its trains in order to permit of this examination being made it could be fined \$500. We must be reasonable in these matters. A gentleman who has a number of people in his employment may be about closing his premises. An officer of the government steps up at about the time they are closing and says: I demand that I shall be permitted to go through and make a thorough examination of the goods in this warehouse. If you obstruct me you are liable to a fine of \$500. The merchant says: I am going to close my premises and you may come back at some more convenient season. Then, he is liable to a penalty and to a penalty of \$500 if he is taken before a partisan magistrate who sees fit to go to the full statutory limit. Other cases may arise. A merchant has married a wife and as scripture hath it, 'therefore cannot come' to wait upon the government official forthwith, and he too therefore will be fined \$500 if the instrument of the government for the time being should summon him before a partisan magistrate—and we have had glaring examples of partisan magistrates time and again. I feel that there is a bond of sympathy between the hon. Minister of Agriculture and myself as farmers engaged in the common undertaking of expediting the business of this House, as we are both trying to do to-day, and also in bring good results to the farmers, and I would say to my hon. friend that taking it all in all, as this is to some extent an experimental matter, it is unwise that we should put this drastic measure in force in its present form. I therefore propose to change the maximum

Mr. LENNOX.

fine from \$500 to \$100 and make the lowest penalty \$5 instead of \$25. It will be carrying out the principle involved in the law, it will afford reasonable means of enforcing the law, it will be a protection to the man who until the law becomes known, bona fide objects to inspection, and at the same time it will give ample power to the government officials. And, if a further argument is required I will point to the fact that this penalty of \$500 stands side by side with the penalty under section 8 which has been reduced to \$25. Surely this penalty under section 10 might be reduced to \$100.

Mr. FISHER. I would say in reply to the arguments of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) in the first place, that this question was discussed in the committee and the committee decided to retain the penalty as it is. I would say again that this penalty is not a penalty under ordinary circumstances for the contravention of the law, but it is the penalty for a person who obstructs an officer in the discharge of his duty, a serious offence, an offence which must be deliberate as the officer will have to declare what his duties are and what he is there for. The penalty of \$500 is the limit. I can imagine circumstances under which a person would obstruct an officer in the execution of his duty in carrying out the law where \$500 would not be at all too much as a penalty for the offence. But, the penalty of \$500 is not necessary. The penalty is to be \$25, and it may be increased up to as high as \$500. Under these circumstances I do not think the penalties as herein described are too great, and I must ask the House to reject the amendment.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that this Bill, if adopted, will not interfere with the sale of seed from one farmer to another. I wish to draw the minister's attention to a new form of selling seeds in Ontario by one farmer to another and perhaps I can do so by reading the following advertisement:

Seed Fair, Town Hall, Brampton, Saturday,  
February 25th.

Under the direction of the Peel Farmers' Institute, Professor Zavitz, Guelph Agricultural College, will be present and deliver an address on 'Selection of Seed' in the afternoon.

All persons having seed grain, clover, grass, corn or potatoes to dispose of are invited to bring samples (two bushels). Open to everybody, but exhibitor must become a member of Farmers' Institute.

Exhibits of new varieties are specially desired, even though not for sale.

The Institute will not assume responsibility for quality of seed.

Send in your entries as early as possible, stating variety, quantity for sale and price per bushel.

This is a splendid opportunity to sell seed. The demand will be good, as seed is scarce.

G. Downey,  
President.

T. J. Cumberland,  
Secretary.