

On the first of August 1905, before any representations in pursuance of the Resolution of the Committee of Agriculture of the Canadian House of Commons could have been made to the British authorities, the Board of Agriculture addressed to Lord Lyttleton a letter which was communicated to the Canadian Government and in which reference was made to the Embargo as follows.—

"Experience has shown that the existing statutory requirements that all cattle imported into this country shall be slaughtered in wharves provided for the purpose at the port of landing is no obstacle to the development and maintenance of a large and valuable trade. In the case of Argentina, the number of cattle imported into Great Britain steadily rose from 4,200 in 1891 to 85,000 in 1899, when the trade was interrupted by the introduction of Foot and Mouth disease in the country. The value of the imports in question was £68,000 in 1901 and £1,392,000 in 1899. During the whole of that period the requirement of slaughter was in force. The case of the United States shows similar results. The number of cattle imported in 1879 was 76,000 with a value of £1,782,000. In 1904 the number imported was 401,000 with a value of £7,160,000.

"Slaughter at the port of landing was required for the first time in 1879 and has been enforced ever since. The Board are glad to observe that similar results are indicated in the case of Canada. The imports during the past two years have been as follows :

No. of cattle imported :	Declared value :
1903. 190,812	£3,315,762
1904. 146,598	£2,547,451

"The highest figure recorded prior to 1892, when the slaughter at the port of landing was first required, was in 1890. The imports in that year were 120,469 with a declared value of £1,892,298. The existing law does not cast any stigma or discredit upon Canadian cattle, for it holds good not only in the case of the United States and other countries, but also in that of every British Colony, including both Australia and New Zealand whence live cattle have in the past been imported into Great Britain. It is in fact a sanitary law of universal application of great importance to stock-owners at home as a valuable safeguard against the introduction of disease, but not at all inconsistent with the transaction of a large and growing trade, as already shown.

"The experience of Argentina in 1900, and more recently of the United States in 1902, has shown how suddenly and unexpectedly Foot and Mouth Disease may make its appearance in a country, quite irrespective of the maintenance of an efficient veterinary organization. In the former case diseased animals were actually imported into this country, and it was only by dint of good fortune and the most strenuous exertions that the infection was kept within the limits of the Foreign Animals Wharves. A similar result might well have happened in 1902 in the case of the United States, notwithstanding the ability and the energy of the Department of Agriculture in that country."

"The enormous losses which British agriculturists have suffered during the last thirty years, mainly by reason of the increased pressure of colonial and foreign competition, make it more than ever necessary that every possible precaution should be taken against the introduction of diseases, consistent with the reasonable requirements of colonial producers and the interests of consumers at home. The consequences of the recurrence in Great Britain of epidemics of disease, such as have been experienced in the past, would now be disastrous, and consumers as well as producers would be affected throughout the country. It is therefore in the general interest that no risk should be taken which can be avoided by the maintenance of a law which provides a considerable measure of security against the introduction of disease, and at