

dicated that he thought the people of Canada were on the whole satisfied with the existence of the embargo. I have before me his words and this part of his utterances is as follows:

He accepted his colleague's statement—

That was a statement contained in a despatch which I had the honour of recommending to council and which was sent forward through usual channels to the imperial government.

He accepted his colleague's statement that Canadians were not satisfied and would like the Act repealed, but this could not be the unanimous opinion in Canada for the Department of Agriculture of the Northwest Territories declared in 1902 that the prohibition of the admission of Canadian live cattle into England might prove to have been a blessing in disguise in developing feeding and the dead meat trade of Canada.

I looked up the reference in the report of the Department of Agriculture of the Northwest Territories and I found a paragraph in the report of 1902, page 55-56 which reads as follows:

Of course, opinions differ as to whether or not the embargo is a blessing in disguise. Some very excellent authorities state that the final effect of the embargo will be to force the Canadian farmer into grain finishing all cattle before export, and that it will also have a tendency to hasten the development of the dead meat trade. If either of these predictions is realized, and there seems to be every reason why they should be brought about, we may well characterize the action of the British authorities in this matter as a 'blessing in disguise.'

That utterance might perhaps justify the statement of the Minister of Agriculture the right hon. Lord Onslow, at Youbil, on February 8, 1905. Lord Onslow has since ceased to be Minister of Agriculture, and has been succeeded by the right hon. Aylwin Fellowes.

I venture to think that statement in the report of the Agriculture Department of the Northwest Territories would not meet with general acceptance even in the Northwest Territories, and still less in other parts of Canada. I venture to think that while some people may desire to develop the dead meat trade, a very laudable desire, while some people may consider that it is better for us in Canada to grain-finish our cattle and send them to England fully ready for slaughter—also a very good opinion and one in which I share—still that does not prevent us from seeing that the embargo is a detriment to the Canadian cattle trade and to the producers of cattle in Canada. It is true, I believe at any rate, that we ought to develop a dead meat trade with England. It is true, I believe, that it is in the interests of the Canadian farmers that cattle sent to England should be finished to the highest state of perfection before they are sent, but even so, as far as the live trade

Mr. FISHER.

in cattle is concerned, the embargo requirement that our cattle should be slaughtered at the port of landing and within ten days, is and always will be, a detriment to our live cattle trade. Whether the cattle arrive in perfect condition or not, the fact that they require to be slaughtered at the port of entry limits them to those particular local markets. If the animal arrives in Liverpool, it must be slaughtered there, it cannot be sent to Leeds, Birmingham, Bradford or any other market. That limits our market to the ports of landing. In the second place it has to be slaughtered within ten days. That limits our owners to ten days' choice as to the date of slaughter and as to the conditions of the market. In addition to that frequently our animals arrive in England after stormy voyages in a condition in which they are not fit for immediate slaughter and they ought to be either put at pasture or fed for more than eight days before they are fit for slaughter if they are to obtain the best price. Under these circumstances and from these points I think that whether we develop a dead meat trade or a live meat trade, the embargo is a detriment to our trade and a financial injury to the people of Canada.

Certain statements have been made in regard to the course of this unfortunate affair. I must compliment the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) who has given us a very concise and succinct history of the occurrences. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) who proposed this motion also gave us a good deal of valuable information. I am going to confine myself therefore entirely to the present condition of affairs and say a few words simply on these points. In the first place I regret to say that one imperial Minister of Agriculture after another, first the Right Hon. Mr. Hanbury, second the Right Hon. Lord Onslow, and third the Right Hon. Aylwin Fellowes, have each and all of them declared most emphatically that as long as they and their government remain in power the embargo shall not be removed. Far be it from me for a moment to enter into political controversy or political struggles in England. I think we in Canada would resent it if the British people were to express opinions upon our political questions here for the purpose of influencing our elections. I therefore feel that I must speak with the greatest reserve and care in this matter because at the present time, with the political struggles that are going on in England, this question is undoubtedly a bone of contention in the political arena. What I say therefore I wish to have it fairly understood is not being said in any party way or sense as regards the political struggle in England to-day. It applies not to the present government, not to any future government but to the action of the people there. I am not going to attribute motives as to the reasons why the embargo is re-