

that when these regulations are practically worked out it will be found that they are of no practical advantage to the settlers there, and the Government will be obliged to change them and change them quite materially. I do not wish to detract from any credit that the Government is entitled to for anything they have done in connection with the Department of Agriculture. I think the present Minister is endeavouring to do his best, and with many of the things he has done I am heartily in accord. But I do say that he is not entitled to so much credit in this case over the late Government, because they were going to do the same thing. Until it was seen that it was impossible for the Canadian Government to secure the withdrawal of the embargo upon our cattle in England, it was inadvisable to do anything about the relaxation of the quarantine regulations. But when it was found that this could not be done, the late Government attempted to do what the present Minister has done. The idea being carried out, in my opinion it might have been carried out with better and stricter regulations, regulations that would inure more to the benefit of the Canadian farmer than those that have been adopted.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes with a discussion of this question from a strictly non-partisan standpoint. I regret very much that a question of such importance to the country, and especially to the western country, should have led to so much discussion, which was, to my mind, more historical and partisan than matter of fact. On this question it may be admitted, perhaps, that I speak with some authority, as I happen to represent the constituency that is probably most deeply interested in this quarantine question, by reason of the number of stock held in it and by reason of its situation. I would like to set before the House as clearly as possible the different questions that are affected by this matter, and that, with all deference to preceding speakers, have been rather mixed up. I should like to sort these questions out, so to speak, so that there may be a clearer understanding of the effects in regard to each one.

Now, as to the good intentions of the Minister of Agriculture and the Government in bringing about this change of the quarantine regulations, I do not suppose there can be any question. This was not a partisan move, but one intended in the general interest of the agricultural community. In the discussions in the Agricultural Committee last session, men of all parties spoke in favour of the abolition of these quarantine regulations—not that I spoke in favour of them, for I did not. There is a certain difference of interest between the west and the east in this matter of stock and cattle generally, which I would like to point out to the House. While in the east, the drift

is towards the States from Canada, in the west the drift is from the States to Canada; so that, while there is an antagonism in the eastern states to our Canadian stock going over there, so in the west there is an antagonism to American stock coming to our side of the line. There are reasons for this which do not need to be particularized now. I am simply stating a fact which must be borne in mind when considering and discussing this question. Now, we in the west believe in governments that will work in the line of the greatest good to the greatest number; and, as the greatest number of people is in the east, we do not expect that our special interests will receive special consideration at the hands of the east to their own prejudice. At the same time, we would not be doing what is right by those who sent us here if we did not represent the special interests of the west as the people of the west understand them. We do not expect impossibilities on the part of the Government; but we certainly cannot expect the Parliament or this Government to legislate satisfactorily in regard to our special interests unless Parliament is thoroughly informed as to what those special interests are. In regard to the matter of sheep quarantine, I am bound to say that the experience of the past has been that a quarantine is necessary for the prevention of the disease called scab being introduced into the flocks of sheep on the Canadian side of the boundary. This disease was introduced some years ago accidentally, and it cost the southern range country many thousands of dollars before it was got rid of. Not only was there the loss of sheep dying through the disease, and the cost of eradicating the disease, but, during the continuance of the pest, the sheep could not be sold and had to be held on the ranges, being thus dead stock, for two if not three years. The loss was tremendous; and it is desirable that it should not be repeated. Now I am aware of the provisions contained in the new quarantine regulations for the protection of sheep from the introduction of disease; and, while I believe that these regulations are probably sufficient for the conditions prevailing in eastern Canada, I certainly, on the information I have, cannot consider them effective in regard to the protection of sheep in western Canada, that is to say, in the ranching country. Where sheep are brought in by two, or three, or a dozen—and that is the only way, I believe, in which they are brought in from the states to eastern Canada—they are distributed among the bands in small numbers which are kept in closed fields in the farms of eastern Canada, and it is a very small matter to know whether disease has been brought in, and to isolate that disease if it has been brought in. But in the west where bands run into the hundreds of thousands, the introduction of disease among them is a serious matter, and