

they have not given their friends to understand that this Bill should not become law this Session. I would ask if the Government have not led those interested in nursery stock on the other side of the line to understand that this Bill would not be allowed to become law. It is trifling with this House for the First Minister or the Minister of Justice to refer this Bill to a Committee whereby to strangle it. They should have the manliness, the fortitude, the determination to treat this Bill in a fair and equitable manner. They should allow the people of the United States to know distinctly whether they are going to allow this Bill to become law or not, and not relegate it to a Committee to be slaughtered there. The promoter of the Bill has introduced a Bill, of what nature? He says that in the United States peddlers are charged \$50 for the privilege of peddling fruit trees, if they go from one State to another or even among citizens of one State, and he pretends to say that the nurserymen or agents selling fruit trees should likewise pay a tax here. This is a State tax for revenue purposes. This is quite a different Bill. Does the United States impose upon agents receiving trees from Canada going into the United States a bond that those trees shall be in such and such a condition? What would be the result if this Bill becomes the law of the land? It would virtually exclude every nurseryman from one end of the country to the other from having the opportunity of selecting fruit trees from nurserymen of the very best standing in the United States. It would compel our people to accept fruit trees from our own nurserymen, and our nurserymen could bring whatever fruit trees they felt disposed to from the other side, take them to their own nurseries and distribute fruit trees grown there throughout Canada. I ask this House whether we should treat in this unfair and unjust manner those who are carrying on business as agents of nurserymen on the other side, and compel them to give a bond that the trees would be as specified, and that the nurserymen, if they appointed sub-agents, should give a bond and come to the Secretary of State's office here and register their names. If this Bill should become law it really means the prohibition of the importation of nursery trees from the United States to Canada. Are the Government prepared to place a measure on the Statute-book to prevent nursery stock coming from the United States? The Americans allow small fruits to go from Canada to the United States. Is this the kind of feeling the Government wish to encourage between this country and the United States? Is this what we are to expect as a sort of compensation for allowing Americans to fish in our waters? Are the Government going to compel the Americans to pay a little homage to us on account of fruit trees? It is unfair to adopt this course in regard to this Bill. I ask them to come forward and say whether they will or will not allow this Bill to become law. I appeal to the First Minister, and ask whether he has not already promised those engaged in the business on the other side that such a Bill as this would not become the law of the country at the present time. I appeal to him as to whether he has not already undertaken that this Bill should not become law during the present Session. If such be the case, it is wrong to leave these agents, who are anxious to know whether their business is going to be interfered with, in doubt as to the Government's policy. The First Minister claims to be the friend of his country, he claims that he desires to do everything in the interests of the Dominion, and yet it is unreasonable that he should consider this Bill merely for the sake of not giving offence to the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle). Such is not the course any hon. gentleman should take in this House. It would be more manly to say what he intended to do and what he did not intend to do, and we must view with the most serious apprehension the passage of this Bill. I am opposed, therefore, to this Bill going to a Special Committee. I believe its refer-

ence would be injurious to the public interests and detrimental to the best interests of Canada, and if it be referred to that Committee I have no guarantee and no reason for believing that those engaged in the nursery business can carry on their trade during the coming season. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), may bring strong pressure to bear to allow the Bill to pass into law, and thereby those engaged in the nursery business would be hampered in conducting their business during the coming season. For these reasons and for other reasons I consider that the course pursued by the First Minister and the Government is hardly a fair one for those engaged in the trade in Canada and is not fair to the people of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), in the course of his remarks, gave us an indication of the reasons that actuated him in bringing this Bill into this House. He tells us that a year ago the Government removed the duty from nursery stock, and that, in consequence of this, Canadian nurserymen have since been subjected to a fierce competition from American dealers in nursery stock, and it is for this reason that he desires to give them protection again in the indirect manner that this Bill proposes. It is, therefore, that this fierce competition may be remedied, it is for that purpose that the Bill is brought before this House. The hon. gentleman spoke of rubbish being brought from American nurseries. I know something about nursery stock, and I have bought nursery stock both from Canadian and American nurserymen, and it is a very good thing for the farmers of Canada that we have American competition in this matter. We get from the Rochester nurseries, the most extensive on this continent, the best class of stock obtainable, and it is a great boon to the farmers to be able to obtain that stock, and any impediment placed in the way of obtaining it is one detrimental to the interests of the farmers at large, however it may affect the interests of the nurserymen in the county of Monck. This Bill, if it should become law, would inevitably produce irritation. The first clause provides that a Canadian nurseryman may give a bond himself. It says: The principal may give a bond and that bond shall enable him to employ any number of agents in Canada. But a principal of a nursery stock firm in the United States is not permitted to give his bond, although I am told by some of them they are perfectly willing to do so, but his bond is to be exacted for every agent and every employé of that firm selling stock in Canada. Now, some of those nursery farmers employ two or three hundred agents, and the agents work for them, some probably for a few days or some probably for a month or two, and to exact bonds of a thousand dollars each from those agents is simply to prevent them from the privilege of doing business in Canada at all. This would be interpreted as a most unjust provision, and as a cowardly provision as well, because it aims indirectly to do that which the Government does not dare to do directly, for if it comes into force it will prevent those persons from doing business in this country at all. In Congress last session a Bill was introduced by Mr. Baker, I think, who I believe is the member for Monroe County, New York, which is the seat of the great nursery interest of the State of New York and of the United States. This Bill in the preamble sets forth the fact that the Bill introduced in the Canadian Parliament by Mr. Boyle—that gentleman's name is mentioned—was a reason for calling on the Congress of the United States to retaliate, and as an act of retaliation they proposed among other things to place a duty of five cents a dozen on eggs. Our exportation of eggs to the United States in one year was about fourteen million dozens, amounting to more than \$2,000,000 in value, and a duty upon eggs would effect every housewife in this country. I do not know of any duty upon any article which would have a more disastrous effect on the fortunes of the party opposite than a duty im-