

Mr. SPROULE. Then there is something radically wrong with a friend of the minister's who said not very long ago in my hearing, one of the great advantages of this reciprocity arrangement was that under it our butchers can get in supplies from across the line inside of two or three days. If hogs, however, are detained for 30 days they can not do that.

Mr. FISHER. I am not responsible for that statement. The statement I have just made is perfectly correct.

Mr. SEXSMITH. In the reciprocity arrangement it is provided that no regulation shall be made or maintained to unreasonably hamper a free exchange of products. I would understand that to mean that the quarantine of 30 days on hogs would be removed.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SEXSMITH. And that representations from either side would receive due attention and any just cause of complaint removed. If we are to have reciprocity in hogs under this agreement, the minister is taking that away by his quarantine regulations.

Mr. FISHER. The agreement does not in any way modify the quarantine arrangements; but if, for the purpose of blocking trade, we were to vexatiously and improperly enforce quarantine arrangements, that would come under that clause. But the quarantine arrangements for the protection of the health of animals cannot in any way be influenced by this tariff arrangement.

Mr. LALOR. Have the United States quarantine arrangements against Canada such as we have against the United States?

Mr. FISHER. The United States quarantine arrangements are not the same as ours. I could not say offhand just what they are in regard to hogs. But Canada has very little hog cholera, whereas, unfortunately the northern tier of states of the United States has a great deal of it. We have been absolutely obliged to keep up quarantine to prevent the introduction of hog cholera into Canada.

Mr. SEXSMITH. With a guarantee that the hogs are all right, they can come in—

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Not with the certificate of a veterinary?

Mr. FISHER. That makes no difference in the case of hogs.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister tell us whether he urges upon the farmers in general the advisability of shipping hay and grain instead of feeding on the farm?

Mr. FISHER. That would be a question of circumstances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister claim that it is generally understood to be a wise policy?

Mr. FISHER. It may or may not be, according to circumstances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not the fact that the minister went to Kingston some years ago and delivered a lecture in the course of which he made a statement showing the different values taken from the soil from different products of the farm, and strongly opposed the shipping of hay or grain off the farm?

Mr. FISHER. Quite possibly I did, under the circumstances that surround Kingston.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We must try to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory for this is an important matter, and the minister has made an important statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have to call the hon. member's (Mr. Armstrong's) attention to the fact that we are now discussing an item for the health of animals. If he proposes to apply what he is saying to that, it will be in order, but a general discussion of agricultural problems will not be in order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This, I understand, is a vote of \$50,000 for the animal industry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, the health of animals.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Food would naturally come in on that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is applied in that way—

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is the application I wish to make, and it is an important application. Some weeks ago, the Minister of Agriculture made a statement in this House to the effect that the farmers of certain sections of our country would receive wonderful advantage from the shipments of hay and grain—

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is discussing not the food the animals eat, which is the only food that can affect their health, but the food that they do not eat. Therefore, his arguments do not apply.