

gress. That is in agreement with the sense of the House, which believes the result aimed at very desirable but very difficult of accomplishing. The more we look into the matter, the more we find that a great deal of care and elaboration will be necessary before the measure can be put into such a shape that it will be a benefit to the country. It is possible to pass the measure in such a shape that it will prove a dead letter. It would be looked upon as a very harsh thing if large penalties were enforced against persons who, to a certain extent, were innocent and were proceeding to carry on this business as it has been carried on for many years past. The difficulty of bringing home an offence to any particular person, I am sure the hon. minister has already realized, would be enormous. At the same time, we cannot make any great mistake in going on to consider the clause further. I do not anticipate that the minister will succeed in putting the Bill into such a shape as he will feel like making it an operative law in the course of the coming year. He could hardly do that at this late stage of the session. The House generally is disposed to take an interest in a Bill. Many members have taken part in the discussion and everybody has shown a desire to assist the minister and facilitate the progress of the Bill. Special attention has been paid to it by hon. members from the province of Quebec. One reason, no doubt, is that it will affect many people in that province. Timothy seed, of the best quality, we know is produced in Quebec, and many thousand bushels are marketed in Montreal every year. For my own part if the hon. minister does not desire to withdraw his Bill, if he will hold this section for further amendment, we might go through other sections without any great loss.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I have already said I am opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and I have already said that I did not think it would be wise to bring this Bill into force this year. As I have said the time for the seed trade is practically upon us and the conditions imposed by this Bill will, I do not say revolutionize, but change in some respects this important trade. Therefore, I think it would be wise to delay. If the minister needs a precedent, I would refer him to the case of the Fruit Marks Act which was brought in one session and discussed, and it was then decided that some such law was needed. The Bill was left over until the following session. That law has been beneficial and the treatment of it might be taken as a precedent in this case.

Mr. CLANCY. I confess I am a little puzzled by the action of the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked what seems to me a very fair question—whether the minister would insist that the Bill should go through in its present shape. The hon. minister had declared that

he had an open mind on the question, he invited fair discussion and said he was not averse to any reasonable amendments, but was entirely in the hands of the committee. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier without uttering another sentence in view of the statements of the hon. minister, withdrew his amendment. To the surprise of everybody, the minister arose in something like a passion and declared that he would not allow the amendment to be withdrawn except on conditions laid down by himself. That seems a piece of pettishness on the part of the minister. I am in favour of any measure that will make for better conditions with regard to the subject dealt with by this Bill. But I would infinitely rather see the Bill stand over than have it pass in its present shape—and that is what the hon. minister means to insist upon, as is evident by his language in refusing to allow the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to withdraw his amendment. I will therefore vote for the amendment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has so completely misrepresented the position, unintentionally—

Mr. CLANCY. Order.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am in order. He has so completely misrepresented what has occurred that I have to put him right. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) came late into the discussion and not knowing what had been said began to criticise the Bill.

Mr. MONK. I did not criticise the Bill, I criticised section 4.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which is part of the Bill. And my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has stated what is quite correct—that until my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier entered the discussion everything was proceeding smoothly, hon. members offering suggestions which were discussed on both sides without antagonism or asperity. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier concluded his remarks by moving that the committee rise, which, as he knew, and everybody knows, is to kill the Bill. That was his obvious intention—his stated intention. I said I could not accept such a motion. I was willing to discuss the Bill in all its phases, but I was not ready to dispose of it in this way, and so asked the committee to reject the motion. After further discussion the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked a question which I answered exactly in the sense I had stated to the committee in the earlier part of the evening. He then rose and stated, in essence, if not in the identical words I give, that, as I was going to completely change my Bill, he would withdraw his motion. I said I would not allow him to withdraw his motion on those terms, because I had not stated that I would completely change my