

by number. You might buy any quantity of seeds of any kind without their being numbered at all, although of course some are of a better quality than others. I may mention that some wholesale seedsmen classify their seeds—I refer now to clover and timothy seed—by the names of certain animals. A superfine seed they would call by the name of some fur bearing animal, for instance, the ermine, and they would classify other grades by the names of other fur bearing animals. Grasses are named in the same way. So these dealers might sell any quantity of seeds of any kind without being liable, under this Bill, for selling seed as No. 1. I cannot find anything in the measure by which you would be able to touch them if they sold seed under some particular name. Then there is another penalty provided if the dealers do not put a certain brand on the bag or receptacle containing seed, giving the name of the noxious weed seeds it may contain. Suppose that the wholesale seedsmen of this country agree to put a particular label or ticket on every bag of seed they sell, showing that the seed may contain the different weed seeds mentioned in the Bill; they might put these labels on all the seeds sold and there would be no means of determining what they were selling as No. 1, they would be within the requirements of the Act and could not be punished. So there would be no remedy for a farmer if he bought impure seed. I object to the legislation passing through this House that will not be effective. I am heartily in accord with the Minister of Agriculture in his desire to get clean seeds for the farming community, and if the Bill was likely to be effective even in a small measure in bringing this about, I would give it my hearty support. But there are many ways in which the penalties might be evaded, and a great deal of seed could still be sold without the purchaser being able to get at the wholesaler if he sold impure seed. I think it would be well to have this phase of the Bill thoroughly looked into, and I think it would be well to send the Bill before the Agricultural Committee where we could hear, not only the farmers and the wholesale seedsmen, but also the retail dealers throughout the country. These latter are an important class, and the Bill ought to be carefully considered from their standpoint, as well as from the standpoint of other persons interested, in order that we may crystallize all the information into legislation which will be a benefit to the farmers of this great Dominion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Elson) in speaking on this Bill. He spoke as a farmer, and I speak as a farmer myself. We are all interested in any measure that is calculated to benefit them. Like the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), I am going to vote for the amend-

ment, not because I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, but because I think that in its present form it is not in the interests of the farmers. I think the Bill can be greatly improved by sending it to the Committee on Agriculture where the farmers can be heard on it, as I think they should be heard on it. I am opposed to it for several reasons. In the first place, I think in its present form it would be detrimental to the farmers in selling their clover and other small seeds, because it will amount just to this, that a few dealers who will go into the business after this Bill becomes law will be mulcted one or two dollars per bushel on every bushel of clover seed they sell. I am also opposed to it because it will have the effect of driving a certain class of people out of the trade, who are to-day doing a great deal to supply farmers with good seed, I refer to the millers. I know what they are doing in this direction, I have been in the milling business myself for the last ten years, and I know to what trouble they have put themselves in order to get pure seed for the farmers at actual cost. I just wanted to offer my objection to the Bill as it is at present and I trust that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will not be so arbitrary but that he will be a little more lenient in his views and allow this amendment to carry and possibly next session, or at some time in the future, allow the Bill to be presented in a more practical form.

Amendment (Mr. Cockshutt) negatived on division.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that the order for such be discharged and that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend the 10th paragraph thereof by striking out the word 'five' where it occurs between the words 'exceeding' and 'hundred' in the fifteenth line of said paragraph and substituting the word 'one' therefor, and by striking out the word 'twenty' from the said fifteenth line.

He said: I wish to direct the attention of the House to the wording of section 10 for a moment. The 10th section provides that any person charged with the enforcement of the Act may enter upon the premises of the owner or other premises, including the premises of a railway or steamboat company and may take samples and so on. Then it goes on to provide that any person who obstructs or refuses to permit the making of any such examination or the taking of such samples of seed shall upon summary conviction be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500 and not less than \$25. The other section providing for penalties is section 8. I pointed out at an earlier stage of the discussion that the penalties under section 8 might amount to as high as \$25,000, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), upon further considering the Bill saw his