

with the animals sent over on the 'Monkseaton' here. But what I do feel is that the British Board of Agriculture know that we have no disease here, and that we have given them ample evidence of that fact. I would say in reply to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that even if two animals out of a million and a half were suspected of being diseased, that is no guarantee that there is disease in the cattle of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdiike) to misunderstand me as contending that they were diseased because I think it was shown beyond any possibility of doubt that they were not cases of pleuro-pneumonia at all.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I claim that Canadian cattle shippers feel deeply the injustice that is being done. While views may differ as to the advantage to be derived from sending out of the country live and unfinished cattle to be fattened abroad, there is a unanimity of feeling that the embargo is virtually a declaration that disease prevails among Canadian cattle while there are none healthier in the world. This is the sting. It is an untruth on its very face and that untruth should be rectified at all costs. There are no politics in this question and all parties should unite in demanding the rights of the Canadian farmers.

Expert evidence from the best veterinary professors in the world proves our herds to be free from disease. I have before me the statements of the professors at McGill, of Prof. Smith of Toronto and of several professors on the other side of the Atlantic who certify that there was no such disease known in this country, and that this very animal was not afflicted when she arrived in Glasgow. I think I am safe in saying that the British Board of Agriculture, for the last fourteen years, have been and are at present perverting the facts by mean subterfuges and equivocal language for the purpose of continuing a system of protection, not against disease, but against competition in live stock from the Dominion of Canada. This has been going on since 1892. Efforts have been made by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to have the embargo removed but with no effect. A deaf ear has been turned to us on all occasions. I claim that their persistent ignoring of all evidence, their repudiating of all fair trade principles, their denials of justice to Canada, their dishonest and unpatriotic treatment of the Canadian cattle question prove them to be either wanting in statesmanship or false to the interests of the British empire, of which Canada is at least an important pillar, that they have proved themselves therefore to be unfit to hold the important position which they occupy in the British government, and that they should be overruled in their blind and unpatriotic course by the British people at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. BERGERON. In spite of our preference?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. In spite of our preference. I claim that they are continuing a system of protection not against disease, and I believe they are well aware of the fact. Now, Sir, there are many in Canada, including myself, who say let the embargo remain if a good sound reason can be given for it, but it might be well that I should first point out when and why the embargo was placed on Canadian cattle. In November, 1892, the British government issued an order requiring all Canadian cattle landed in the United Kingdom to be slaughtered within a limited time at the port of debarkation. Previous to this action Canadian cattle had been free to be moved from place to place in the United Kingdom, under those circumstances it was possible to hold them over from one market to another if prices were bad. There was also a considerable trade done in stockers, or what is known in England as half-fattened animals, which Scotch and English farmers bought, fed and finished. The ground of the British government's action was the alleged discovery of a case of pleuro-pneumonia in an animal from Canada that had been shipped to Scotland, and in connection with this case, after a thorough investigation having been made it was proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the animal had contracted the disease in Scotland after leaving the ship. Efforts have been made on many occasions since to secure the withdrawal of the scheduling order on the ground that pleuro-pneumonia was a disease unknown in Canada. It was also shown to Mr. Gardiner, the then president of the British Board of Agriculture, that the animal had contracted the disease after landing in Scotland.

It is a disputed question in this country as to whether it is better for this country to ship unfinished or to feed them here and send them over in a finished condition. There are differences of opinion about that. It may be that Canada's direct financial interests suffer little from the embargo, but this does not detract from the truth of the fact that the embargo is unjust, that it is suspiciously like a subterfuge; if it does not diminish Canada's credit it certainly injures her reputation.

Great Britain claims that we have disease amongst our herds. Our reply to that is, that if it is a disease it should be given its proper name, namely, 'protection,' and not 'pleuro-pneumonia.' Canadians are the last people in the world to object to any government availing itself of any fiscal system that to it seems good, they are not in the habit of intruding their ideas into other countries' affairs. If Great Britain thinks protection in cattle is the proper thing, we are pleased to say that it is her business, but when a patent piece of protective legislation is devised, and Canadian products