

bags of potatoes or a like quantity of any other vegetable products. This is the reason that we are getting along so well. And we want to do better. We have been told on many occasions in this House, and told truly, that there is need of more production and still more production. If manure from the city of Montreal goes to the United States, and we cannot get it for less than \$52 a car, its present price, and if we must sell our products at one-half or less what we received during the war, what does that mean? It means that we shall reduce our production. And what does that mean for the people of Montreal? If they do not receive from our part of the country the vegetables they require, they will have to go further away for those products and will have to pay about double what they would pay if we had what is necessary for that sort of cultivation, namely, manure from the city at cost price. This is what the people in my riding and the riding next to mine want. I am not sure if any of my hon. friends in this House think it is bad politics to ask this Government to impose an embargo to prevent shipment into the United States of the most essential requirement for successful farming. I do not know how the western members feel about this matter; but as a farmer myself, as one who has been in this House for quite a number of years and who is still a farmer, I would ask them to help me out on this question, because, as I have said before, in our part of the country we need manure in order to grow, not grain as is grown in the West, but vegetables of all kinds for the benefit of the big population of Montreal—and I think the same thing must apply to Toronto and other big cities. We are situated very close to the boundary line, the distance from Montreal to Rouse's Point being about forty-three miles; and my friend, LeFebvre, who has all the sidings and controls all the manure, takes advantage of this to benefit the United States at Canada's expense. That is to say, if the farmers of my riding and of the riding of the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) refuse to pay \$52 a ton f.o.b. delivered at their station, he tells them: "If you do not buy, I will go to the United States and Mr. Miner is open for all the surplus I have." This is the reason why I brought this matter before the House to-day. I do not want to dwell any more on this question. I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) will do all that is possible for the electors and farmers of this country, who

[Mr. Lanctot.]

at the present time are not too prosperous, and give us the manure we require to raise the best crops.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not wish to prolong this debate nor to delay the passing of the agricultural estimates, but yesterday reference was made to the cattle embargo removal in Great Britain, and I had my attention drawn to-day to a certain article in the press giving statements made by the Hon. P. C. Larkin, High Commissioner for Canada, on this subject. The statements that he made reflect upon the honour, integrity and loyalty of the prairie provinces, and I take exception to them. I wish, furthermore, to place this matter before the Government in order to be informed if they understand that Mr. Larkin is making such threats. We are quite prepared to believe that it is in the interest of all Canadians that the embargo should be removed; but we do not believe that the High Commissioner has a right to make a threat to the British Government at the expense of the prairie provinces. The article reads:

Representations of the strongest character concerning the effect which failure to remove the embargo on cattle would produce in Canada have been made to the British Cabinet by Hon. P. C. Larkin. The new High Commissioner has assured the Ministers that the Government's failure to redeem its pledge to remove the cattle ban would place a potential weapon of considerable power in the hands of the annexationists of the Prairie provinces—

Why the prairie provinces?

—and other foes in Canada of the imperial connection. It is understood that he has conveyed to the Cabinet the strong feeling which exists that the decision to leave the question to the free vote of the British Parliament is not regarded by Canada as fully implementing the Government's promise, as given by Lord Ernle during the war. The proposed resolution favoring the lifting of the embargo will probably pass the Commons, and may even pass the House of Lords if Canada makes its demand sufficiently strong, but even then it would be necessary to introduce and pass a bill to carry out the sense of the resolution, and such a measure would be bitterly contested.

Hon. Mr. Larkin has already made a good impression here and the High Commissioner's office seems in a fair way to become the positive force for the advancement of Canada's interests and ends.

Well, if that is the impression that Hon. Mr. Larkin is making, the sooner he is recalled the better. The minister of Agriculture is a loyal citizen of the West and is interested in the prairie provinces, and I call this matter to his attention in the hope that he will not allow it to pass unnoticed by this Parliament. It is a reflection upon