

*Supply—Live Stock*

a bit surprised if, as a result of the discussion that took place yesterday in this House, some remarkable press statements should appear in the United Kingdom with respect to what transpired in this Chamber.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not care whether the minister communicates with Mr. Larkin by cable or otherwise, but I do think that this press report from the special correspondent of *The Gazette* in London should be either retracted or confirmed; for if it is authentic it is a reflection on the people of the West. The matter should be cleared up for their sake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister spoke rather hurriedly, or he would not have given utterance to the expression he used, that the matter of cost should intervene as between correcting or not correcting a statement made by the official representative of this Dominion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is not what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not what my hon. friend said? Then why was the matter of cost introduced if it has no relevancy to the question? Why was it brought in at all?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If you will permit me I will state again what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend will have an opportunity to explain himself, but the matter of cost was introduced by him—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —in connection with the request that he seek to find out whether or not a representative of this country made certain statements attributed to him. It may be that there are false press reports which the Government does not see fit to correct or to pay any attention to. That is quite true. But Mr. Larkin represents this Dominion in Great Britain, and if there are attributed to him statements which he certainly should not make in that capacity, then it is the duty of the Government, undoubtedly, to ascertain whether or not he did make those statements. If they were uttered they were uttered on behalf of this country. Suppose it turns out that he did not make them. Is it not well that this country should know that its representative did not so misunderstand his duty as to give utterance to such sentiments? The country is entitled to know, yes or no. Consequently the minister should say definitely and at once that he will ascertain

[Mr. Motherwell.]

whether those statements were or were not made by Mr. Larkin and let the House know accordingly at the first moment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not yet seen the report. When I see it, if it appears serious enough I will carry out the suggestion made by my hon. friend and by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis). But until I know the source of the report, and the value to be attributed to that source, I do not propose to send cablegrams on information of that kind.

Mr. HOCKEN: Do you want to appoint a royal commission to find out.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The remark I made was that if the Government paid heed to every press report, whether correct or incorrect, a very substantial expense would be incurred for cablegrams. I had not caught the word "annexationist." I do not wonder at the hon. member for Swift Current being exercised over it, inasmuch as the term has been often used against the prairie provinces much nearer home. I will reconsider my decision, Mr. Chairman, and when this estimate is passed I shall take such steps as may be necessary to meet the situation. Yes, it is a very offensive term, and until I get further evidence I shall not be satisfied that it was used by the High Commissioner. But, as I said before, it is often used much nearer home.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in the hon. minister's statement that he understood the railways carried both natural and artificial fertilizers at reduced rates. I sincerely hope his understanding is correct, but I am afraid it is not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They carry natural fertilizers at reduced rates.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did you not include artificial fertilizers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Possibly not.

Mr. CALDWELL: When the Board of Railway Commissioners ruled that gravel and crushed stone for roadmaking purposes would not be subject to the increased rates, I inquired of them whether ground limestone for agricultural purposes and artificial fertilizers might not come under the same ruling, as I thought it was of more interest to the country at large to have cheap transportation of fertilizers than even of road-making materials. I would urge upon the minister to take up with the