

Mr. SMITH: No; the expenses are to come off the party whose trees are cut down. We recommended that the owner be compelled to cut the trees down.

A DELEGATE: In the Central Farmers' Institute that question of weeds has come up time and again; and I doubt if they would do any more in that direction; but in regard to black-knot they would co-operate.

Mr. M. PETTIT: The original act to prevent the spread of the yellows was a good act, and very easily put in force; and I think if we asked that this be added to that act it would work. I see no necessity for asking for a Provincial inspector with that.

Mr. SMITH: Under the present provisions of the Act there is a penalty of \$20 for every inspector who does not do his duty; but in fact our inspectors do not do their duty, because there is no one to look after them.

Mr. PEART: The inspectors are well known in their own localities, and they are loth to make complaint.

The SECRETARY: I think there should be some one to whom people can appeal. If there is, fruit growers will take advantage of it; they will appeal to this Provincial inspector, and the work will be done. I think the first clause should have the insertion of that provision that the council shall on petition of five ratepayers appoint the inspector. If nobody wants an inspector, the council certainly would feel that they were doing a curious thing in appointing one. I would move that those words be inserted, and that with that change we accept the recommendation of the committee and refer it to the Legislative Committee,

Mr. SMITH: There might be townships where there were not five men with sufficient interest to petition; and yet that township might be a breeding-ground to let disease go sweeping through the whole Province.

Mr. JAMES: If you could not get five men to petition for that, you could not enforce it.

Mr. SMITH: If there were somebody to go around they could get those five men.

The SECRETARY: I think when you have the Provincial inspector, there is somebody to appeal to; and I should think that he could, perhaps, act independent of a local inspector if he were called upon by local individuals.

Mr. J. W. SMITH (Winona): I don't think it is right to have more than one inspector—if I have to pay the bill. After a man goes to the expense of setting out the orchard, and waiting a few years to get something, for a man to come in and say, "So many trees have to be cut down," would be hard; and I think we ought to go carefully. I think the township council should pay the inspector, as they do the road master. The appointment of the road master is statutory. An inspector should inspect an orchard three or four times a year at least; and they should be carefully examined.

Mr. ORR: I think it is a clear case that as it is for the benefit of the whole township, the township should pay.

Mr. ALLAN (Goderich): I am afraid the Secretary's amendment would defeat the object, because neighbors in a township would not like to petition, as it would be said to be an unneighborly act.

Mr. M. PETTIT: The government would not make compulsory legislation where it can be made permissive.

Mr. ORR: Could not those five ratepayers appeal to the Provincial inspector?

Mr. HUNTER: I would bear the black-knot all around me before I would go around to get a petition from five men.

Mr. McMICHAEL: We would soon have the black-knot stamped out if it was made the duty of the councils the same as keeping the roads up; but if it is left to a petition of five the matter will be neglected.