

parties are defying each other, in the manner of those heroes of Homer or of Virgil, with a deep gulf between the two, as to which is the most loyal to the empire, as to which is doing the most to sustain the ideals of empire, I am bound to repeat, in the sensible words of a sensible Englishman,—“humbug,” both ways. Is not this quite impartial, Mr. Speaker?

Those closing words of Mr. Fielding meant something or meant nothing. If they meant something, they meant that the Canadian government was going to recommend to the Canadian parliament, at the next session, a revision of their policy. It was never done; it remained on paper, a declaration of policy which never materialized, and one which, had it been spoken, a phrase very aptly used by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition would exactly fit—“sound without sense”, and without results.

My right hon. friend devoted much of his eloquent address to the demonstration that the practical result of that gesture of imperial loyalty on the part of the Liberal party, of that demonstration of good will, was the removal of the embargo on our Canadian cattle. Here I am on familiar ground. I had as my deskmate in that parliament of 1896 Mr. Robert Bickerdike, who represented the constituency of St. Lawrence, a predecessor long since of my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan). Mr. Bickerdike's trade, like that of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Mullins), was largely concerned with that embargo; and every session, from 1896 to 1907, when I left, and later on, until his death, he had always two motions on the order paper and always prepared a good speech in support of each—the abolition of the death penalty and the removal of the embargo. And he succeeded as well with one as with the other.

That embargo had been imposed by England, in 1892, under false pretences. The British ministers did not want to admit that they were imposing a measure of protection in favour of the cattle raisers of Scotland, of England and especially of Ireland, so they stamped Canadian cattle with a lie: they said they were diseased. The Canadian government, Conservative and Liberal alike, demonstrated by the most expert testimony that could be obtained, that it was untrue. But the British government maintained the embargo. The year 1897 came, with the first preference; the embargo was retained. The years 1899 and 1900 came with a display of oratory, with spending of money, the sending

[Mr. Bourassa.]

of Canadian boys to conquer South Africa for the benefit of the hoarders of gold in Rhodesia. The embargo was maintained. Then came 1911 and 1913 with the two proposals of both parties to help in fighting the battles of the empire on sea—the Liberal proposal, with that so-called Canadian navy in time of peace and imperial in time of war, as described by Mr. Fielding himself, and then the statesmanlike proposal of Sir Robert Borden to take from the public exchequer of this wealthy nation the sum of \$35,000,000 to go to the rescue of poor, downtrodden England, crushed under the burden of her gold and the predominance of her trade the world over. This mighty Canadian nation had to make a gift of \$35,000,000 to poor, little England. I shall never forget the remark of my dear old friend Lord Fisher, who once asked me, “Which is the most foolish of the two parties in Canada?” Still the embargo was kept on. Then the war of 1914 came. We declared war against Germany before England did. We began sending our human flesh to the slaughter market of Europe, and the British government was mighty glad to accept it. But the embargo on Canadian cattle was still maintained, because the interests of the cattle raisers of the British Isles predominated in the British government, whatever might be the party in power, over the sentimental stock phrases used by Canadians. Finally, it was raised, I think, in 1924.

Now, if my good friends to the right had been returned to power last year, what would be the situation? And I did my level best to keep them in power, just as I did something to prevent them from falling from power a couple of years previously; they were then very attentive to my remarks, for the majority was small. In 1930 the majority was larger and their budget was adopted. Suppose they had been supported by the people of Canada and had gone to England. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen remember my suggestion. My idea was—and it still is—that the present leader of the opposition should have gone to London with the late Minister of Justice, to sit at the Imperial conference, so-called, the political one. But I said that I would rather trust the staunch imperialist on the other side of the house to stand as against English selfishness for the preservation of Canadian interests, because he is connected with selfish Canadian interests, and there is nothing like two egotisms in fighting each other. Of course, that could not be. But suppose the late government had been maintained in power. Suppose my right hon. friend had gone with