

once it is introduced it becomes almost uncontrollable except at tremendous cost and loss. Therefore, the House will see how important it is that provisions to prevent the introduction of disease should be made as effective as possible. I am afraid that in the drafting of these resolutions sufficient consideration has not been given to the conditions prevailing in the west whereby the introduction of disease could be prevented. I am perfectly aware that there is a provision by which sheep brought in must have a certificate from the Government inspector on the United States side of the line, showing that they are in a healthy condition. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the House will agree with me that a certificate from an inspector appointed by the United States Government, when we take all the circumstances into consideration, is not an adequate protection against the introduction of disease into this country. Although I do not wish to say anything offensive, still when we consider the system under which officials are appointed in that country, when we consider the general spirit prevailing in that country, I think you will agree with me that when \$100,000 or \$200,000 is at stake, it would be an easy matter to fix an inspector, or to secure almost any kind of certificate from a great many of those Government inspectors. This would not be the case in the east, where each importation would only amount to a few dollars anyway, and it would not be worth the while for the exporter to do any figuring with the Government inspector. The case is different in the west, where a deal may run into hundreds of thousands, and where it is worth the while of the party who is bringing the sheep across, or sending them across, to make any terms that may be desirable with the inspector. Now, in regard to cattle, the case is entirely different. There has not been any introduction of disease amongst Canadian cattle from the United States side of the line. I understand that there is not the same probability, and therefore the same stringency in regard to quarantine is not necessary. When the quarantine regulations were first abolished, or when the people in the west heard they were going to be abolished, they were very much excited, and greatly feared that the abolition of quarantine regulations in regard to cattle would injure their interests severely. The instinct of self-preservation is just as strong in the west as it is in the east, and when the cattle ranchers of the west think they are liable to be injured by any Government regulations they certainly become alarmed, without respect to party politics, just as people in the east do. Therefore, when they feared that the abolition of these quarantine regulations would lower the value of their cattle on those ranches, they certainly did get considerably excited. I may say, Sir that that alarm

Mr. OLIVER.

was considerably increased by the very injudicious acts of an employee of the Government who was sent out there. I suppose, to allay the excitement, which he certainly did not succeed in doing. It was published in the newspapers, whether mistakingly or otherwise, that he had grossly misrepresented public opinion in the west in regard to this quarantine matter, and whatever excitement existed before was greatly increased by this deliberate misrepresentation. However, I am bound to say for the information of the House and for the information of the Government, that so far as matters have gone up to the present time, the cattle interests of the west have not been prejudiced by the removal of the quarantine: on the contrary, I notice in a late issue of the Macleod "Gazette," which may be said to be the organ of the cattle industry in that ranching country of the south, that cattle are bringing to-day a better price than at any time during the past two years, that the demand is better and the price is better; and particularly the price is better for the purpose of supplying the British Columbia market. Now, it was the fear of being shut out of the British Columbia market that stirred up the western ranchmen against the removal of the quarantine regulations in regard to cattle. I am not going to discuss the merits of the question as to what is going to be the result of the abolition of these regulations; but I will merely state as a matter of fact that up to the present time the price of cattle is better than it was before, and therefore the excitement that did arise among the cattlemen has been to a great extent, if not altogether, allayed. That is information that I think it well to put the House in possession of, so that there may not to be any misunderstanding. There was another matter that was discussed at some length by the hon. member who moved the motion, and that was the driving of American cattle across the line for the purpose of enabling them to feed on the better grasses on the north side of the line. That is a matter of very great interest in the western country; it has attracted the attention of a great number of stockmen; and it was the fear that the abolition of the quarantine would facilitate this practice of driving cattle across the line that roused them against the abolition of the regulations. Now, let it be thoroughly understood that the quarantine regulations are not necessary to the ranges of our country. I believe that these ranges can be protected by other means than by keeping up a quarantine, if the quarantine is not otherwise necessary. This is not a question necessarily belonging to the quarantine, and is not necessarily affected by the removing of the quarantine; it is a question that stands by itself. But I would like it to be understood that it is an important question in that country it is one of first-class im-