

posed upon eggs by the American Government, because that duty would bring the argument home to so many families in this Dominion that free trade was a good thing and that an import duty on Canadian products into the United States was a bad thing. I believe the Government ought not to permit this Bill to pass a second reading in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has passed its second reading.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is an unfair Bill, because it provides that the owner of an American stock nursery must give a bond for every single man whom he employs in Canada, while only one bond is exacted from a Canadian nursery owner who may employ any number of agents. That is a very unfair provision and it is a provision that would provoke a bad feeling and provoke retaliation as well. If you want to shut out American nursery stock, impose a duty on it squarely, but do not attempt to shut it out by this flank movement which will, in my opinion, be productive of very bad results.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) charged the Government with introducing a Bill trying to carry by a side wind what they dare not do directly and openly. Now, my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. Boyle) took up this subject of his own accord. He is a member of Parliament. He acted according to his own lights and opinions and introduced this Bill, certainly not at the request, or at the instance, suggestion or knowledge of the Government. He introduced it as an independent member of Parliament, and we have now arrived at its consideration and its second reading has been carried. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that a Mr. Baker introduced a Bill into Congress, and if the hon. gentleman will look at that Bill introduced by this Mr. Baker he will see it was a most ridiculous piece of legislation, and that it certainly would be laughed out of either House of Congress the moment it was brought to a vote. If we in this Parliament cannot introduce any Bill, or discuss any financial or fiscal policy; if we cannot prevent frauds upon our own people for fear that some man at some date may make a motion in Congress, why we might as well dissolve ourselves at once. We in this Parliament are to consider what the interests of this country are, and the suggestion that because Mr. Baker says: if we prevent useless trees, vines or shrubs to be fraudulently brought into Canada they in the States will put a duty upon our goods, ought not to deter us doing our duty by our own people. My hon. friend beside me says that if we pass an Act declaring that the selling of sawdust, pine hams or wooden nutmegs should be punished, we do not do so lest they would have a retaliatory Act in the United States. I think it will be remembered that we passed an Act prohibiting oleomargarine as being a fraud upon our farmers, and we were not afraid that any retaliatory Act of Congress would be held over our heads because if a fraud is practiced on our people we wish to punish that fraud. The details of this Act can be fully considered in Committee, and I think myself that his provisions are of very great use. The very fact that my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. Boyle) has introduced this Bill has warned fraudulent agents that they are watched, and that if they do sell fraudulent goods there is a law here to punish them. The second reading has been passed, and the suggestion is simply that this Bill should be sent to the Committee. I have no doubt that it will be well and fully considered. Neither of the hon. gentlemen opposite have said one word upon the fact that similar legislation indeed more severe legislation has been passed in four of the States of the Union. They have no objections that those States should protect their farmers from fraud; they have no objection that those Legislatures should protect their

Mr. CHARLTON,

farmers from being swindled, as our farmers have been swindled by a parcel of men coming into this country running through the country and selling those trees, grape vines and other shrubs, and then running out of the country and leaving our farmers with this valueless property on hand and with the loss of their money. As to the details of the Act allow them to be judged by the Committee. I think that the farmers of the country will understand who are their friends when they find that there is such a strong advocacy by hon. gentlemen opposite against the interests of the farmer, when a member on this side of the House tries to prevent them from being swindled.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman states that the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), is an independent member of the House, that he can do just as he pleases, and that he introduced this Bill without the advice or even the knowledge of the Government. I have a suspicion that if the right hon. gentleman said to the member for Monck: "Now, you have introduced this Bill, you have put yourself on record, you have shown to your fruit growing constituents what are your desires on their behalf, but it is not judicious to force through the measure as it is at present, you had better withdraw the Bill." I believe that if the right hon. gentleman used such language to the hon. member for Monck, the Bill would have been withdrawn. Therefore, I say that I hold the right hon. gentleman and his Government responsible for the principle of this Bill, though, of course, the details might be settled in Committee hereafter. Since the Government did not prevent this Bill from going to the second reading, they are responsible for the Bill, for we all know they can prevent any of their supporters from forcing a Bill to the second reading if they so desire. After the announcement made in Washington by the right hon. gentleman's accredited diplomatic agent at that port, Mr. Erastus Wiman, and telegraphed from there, I think that both this country and the United States expected that this Bill would be choked at an early stage of its infantile existence. Such not being the fact, however, we have to deal with it now. The hon. gentleman asks us if we are to be debarred from legislating against frauds on farmers for fear some one would propose retaliation in the United States Congress, and he ridicules the idea that Mr. Baker's Bill could be accepted by that Congress. Of course, nobody asks the House to refrain from such legislation for fear retaliation would be proposed in Congress, but we ask the House to refrain because retaliation would be likely to carry there. We all know the temper of that Congress. Instead of its being ridiculous to suppose that the Baker Bill could be accepted, it is likely to pass; and if the hon. gentleman does not wish to laugh at the interests of the farmers and everybody concerned, he should not laugh at the idea of retaliation being carried in response to the distinct challenge which this Bill gives. The hon. gentleman said that three or four States had similar legislation to this. Well, I think when he remembers that the States have not power to deal with commerce or to regulate the importation of articles into those States, he will see that he was mistaken in making that statement, and will have to modify it. They have internal laws dealing with frauds, of course, as any Province of this Dominion might have; but no State can make a law forbidding the importation of foreign goods except under certain conditions, and the hon. gentleman knows it. Every hon. gentleman opposite who has spoken on this question speaks as if the frauds supposed to be perpetrated by nursery agents were perpetrated by Yankees who have come over here to swindle the Canadian farmer. In the first place, I do not think these frauds are numerous. I never heard any one in my constituency complain of being defrauded by Yankee nursery stock. But the men who sell these goods throughout Canada are not Americans; they are our own