

having animals free from these diseases is world wide, it should be our urgent desire to maintain that reputation. That can be done only by constant vigilance, and I think the staff of the Department of Agriculture, health of animals branch, is to be congratulated, not only now but all through the years back as far as you like, or at all events from Doctor Rutherford's time, for the vigilance with which they have watched these problems and built up the reputation that we have as regards freedom from live stock diseases.

May I draw attention to the tremendous propaganda that has gone through the country about the effect of this agreement on our cattle trade. As has been pointed out by many hon. gentlemen, it cannot have any effect in promoting trade as long as the exchange remains as it is. It is a little too bad that that should be the complaint, because possibly if the exchange situation is finally corrected, the complaint will no longer exist and then we shall have the opportunity of reaping some of the benefits of this trade agreement. But so long as the present exchange situation continues, that will be the complaint, and it is during the next year or two that we want this corrected, not in several years from now. I should like to point out to the minister, as an evidence of this, that the new cattle trade which the Department of Agriculture and the government got the credit for developing in the old country immediately after they came into power, has gradually petered out. During the first year they were in office, it started with the very modest number of 5,000 cattle, but as the season was pretty well advanced when they came into power, we may leave that aside. During the second year 26,000 or 27,000 were shipped to the old country and a practically equal number to the United States. But this year the season is over and the number has dropped to almost one-half, it is only a little over 16,000. Let us contrast that with the conditions following 1923 when the real embargo was removed against our feeders and stockers going into the interior of Great Britain for feeding and finishing purposes, and there was no exchange situation militating against that movement. In the second year, after the embargo was taken off, that is, 1924, something like 79,000 cattle were shipped overseas. I shall not count the first year, because we want to get a full year under both governments. The third year, 1925, the number of cattle shipped increased from 79,000 to 110,000. That is many times the cattle export that has taken place in any year since this government came into power. Therefore the exchange situa-

[Mr. Motherwell.]

tion and the low price of cattle are responsible for the small shipment they got started in 1931 dwindling to almost one-half this year, that is from 26,000 to 16,000. It seems to me that all the ballyhoo, if I may use that word, that has been promulgated by somebody through the press as to the wonderful development of the new market in Great Britain during the last two or three years has not been warranted at all. Now the chickens are coming home to roost and are apparently being shooed in that direction further by the exchange situation until the shipments will almost disappear again. I am in hopes the trade may be somewhat revived next year, for the simple reason that the cattle have been retained in Canada, because there is plenty of feed on the range country in the prairies and the ranchers are going to keep them another year. Perhaps they are running the risk of not getting the best figure for them, but they are willing to wait rather than sell them under present sacrifice conditions. They are keeping those cattle, so they will probably add to the total volume shipped next year.

If my hon. friend has any remarks to make which I have not mentioned as to why the number being shipped overseas has dwindled to the extent it has, I shall be glad to hear from him; but unless he has other reasons or better figures than I have, it indicates that the government should exhibit something like becoming modesty such as he invoked me to exercise the other day, and not engage in such extravagant statements as they have been making during the last few years about this wonderful market and about taking the embargo off, when everyone must know that the major embargo was removed in 1923. We may agree for the sake of peace that it was the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mullen) who took it off, but it does not matter who did it. If hon. gentlemen opposite are going to take the ground that every time a little restriction is removed, the embargo is removed, some enterprising gentleman ten years from now will take another little restriction off and claim that he has taken off the embargo once more. Has my hon. friend any reason to give for the dwindling trade with Great Britain in both finished cattle and stockers during the last few years, other than the ones I have given? I think I have been fair in my presentation of the case. I believe it is partly because the situation and the possibilities have been over-talked. Both the low prices and the high exchange are also against our extending the overseas trade in cattle under prevailing conditions.