

In the House of Lords, when the bill was being discussed there, Lord Askwith made this statement:

On the other hand, it was proved up to the hilt that since the year 1896, and for even a longer period, there had been no really serious disease in Canada, and that the claim for keeping Canadian cattle out was not a good one.

I maintain that if we are going to develop that trade with the Old Country we must not do anything to jeopardize the demand which now exists there for our cattle.

I would like to take a moment or two to deal with another point, because I may not have another opportunity of doing so. The responsibility devolves upon the government of helping the Canadian farmer take advantage of the live stock trade with Great Britain. When we were assured that the embargo would be lifted stock men in this country were advised to feed all the good cattle they possibly could in order to take advantage of the opportunity when the time for making shipments came. The result was that a great many farmers throughout the Dominion devoted themselves to feeding the necessary stock hoping thereby to derive the revenue therefrom that was so badly needed. It was brought out before a parliamentary committee and reported to the House to-day—I do not know whether I am in order in discussing it or not—that a combine exists on the north Atlantic which affects adversely the shipping of Canadian products. The steamship companies, as early as last December, gave out the information that the ocean rate on cattle transported from Canada to the Old Country would be \$15 per head. This rate was a considerable reduction from the former charge and was a further encouragement to the farmers to feed cattle for the British market. The fact that the ocean rate for cattle had been reduced to \$15 per head was widely distributed and the propaganda carried on by the Dominion authorities, and the steamship companies, was responsible for a great revival of interest in the live stock trade. But what did the producers find when they had their cattle ready for the market? The same old story—big interests in the form of the North Atlantic Steamship combine boosted the rates; shippers of cattle were informed that no space was available for Canadian stock at the \$15 rate, but that the rate would be \$22.50, then \$25, and even \$30 has been mentioned as a possible rate. Is it any wonder that the farmers of this country have lost their morale in the face of such unjust discrimination? I think that this government can be fairly charged with negligence in not providing ample space.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What would my hon. friend suggest should be done?

Mr. LEADER: The government should have insisted on reasonable ocean rates being granted in the interest of the primary producers. Indeed we might use a stronger term in the face of the fact that our government-owned merchant marine is a party to the combine that exists, sits in conference in a city in a foreign country and sets the rates that Canadian steamships shall charge to transport Canadian goods. Now the advance of \$10 per head in freight rates means a heavy loss for the people of this country. Who will suffer by reason of that extra \$10 being squeezed out of the farmer? Every retail store in Canada, every manufacturer in Canada, every bank, every loan company, indeed every man, woman and child is affected by the contraction or restriction of the spending power of the farmer.

I speak for the farmers of western Canada upon whom transportation costs bear most heavily, and I declare that the time has come—indeed it is long overdue—when the government should insist on a fair measure of relief not only for the producers of the West but the producers of the whole of the Dominion. In concluding my remarks I wish to state this: We have a brand new government, with a very capable Minister of Agriculture, and we want a little ser-  
4 p.m. vice. We would expect the late government, who catered to the “big interests,” to display inertia in matters of this kind. From the present government, however, we expected better treatment and we are still hoping for an improvement in that regard.

Mr. WALLACE: In the matter of the restriction of the number of cattle tested, it is likely to operate to the disadvantage of the small breeder who will be unable to sell his pure-bred cattle owing to the fact that they are not tested. I myself would not buy pure-bred cattle unless they were tested. If the minister and the department could see their way clear to the removal of this restriction, which limits the number of cattle to be tested to ten, it would be a good thing because it certainly works out in a way that is detrimental to the breeder who has but a small herd.

Mr. CALDWELL: I find no great objection to reducing the amount of indemnity for pure-bred cattle that are slaughtered after being condemned under the tuberculin test. I would like, however, to urge upon the minister that he should not discontinue the policy of testing