

is long enough to wait, and the time has come when the Canadian people will determine whether or not we shall go forward to realize the dream, the end aimed at by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1902, and others in the years before that; whether or not we shall endeavour among ourselves, regardless of the attitude of the mother country, to work out a system of preferences.

There were two or three other matters referred to yesterday upon which I think it is necessary that I should make at least a passing comment. One of them dealt with the question of what was called the attitude of mind, the atmosphere of the relations between the British government and our own. I have indicated that the language used by other parts of the empire was not different from my own, and I think the British government will receive, in no spirit of, shall I say, pleasure, the assertion made by the leader of the opposition of this country that the relations between that government and the government of Canada are other than of the most harmonious character. I know such is not the case. I know that my relations, even with the sternest and most unbending of those who were in that conference, one whose views on fiscal questions are well known, were such that my views at least compelled his acknowledged and admitted respect. And my experience with British public men has been entirely different, shall I say, from that of the right hon. gentleman opposite. I have never found them desirous of flip service, as was said by one of them at the conference. I have never seen them desiring to be the victims of flattery or of the oleaginous patronage of any one in the world. But I have seen them always anxious to have frank, plain, blunt statements made, statements which they can understand and appreciate. And if I say that my experience with them has been that our relations have been improved rather than otherwise as a result of the conference, I but state the simple truth. I should not like to have the opinion sent abroad to the four quarters of our world that these gentlemen are in any sense coming as unwilling guests to Canada at an early date. I would not have them think that the leader of the opposition voices the sentiment or the thought of the Canadian people. I should like to have it known that these gentlemen will be welcome guests of ours, and I believe my relations with them will always compare favourably with the relations of my right hon. friend with any people in the world. If there is any virtue in frankness as against circumlocution, if there is any

[Mr. Bennett.]

virtue in a plain statement of the case as distinguished from flowery platitudes and rhetoric, then I have no doubt as to what the position is.

In fairness at least to one of the members of this house it is my duty to correct one misstatement. Yesterday something was said about the cattle embargo. I happened to be in the gallery when the motion in connection with the cattle embargo was made both in the House of Commons and in the Lords in London, at one time in one place and on another occasion in the other. The fact is that in 1917, when Sir Robert Borden, Mr. Rogers, Sir George Perley and Sir Douglas Hazen represented Canada at the Imperial conference, the question of the cattle embargo was taken up. Mr. Walter Long, afterwards Viscount Long of Wraxall, presided at that gathering as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and he said that Sir Robert Borden had pressed upon him the desirability, yea, the necessity of something being done to remove this "stigma" and "slur" from Canadian cattle. Mr. Prothero, afterwards Baron Ernle, said, "Yes, we will take it off". Thereupon Mr. Rogers said—the record is here—"I think we should have a motion". Mr. Long said, "Surely you do not want a motion. However, we will put it down", and down it went. Then the war ended. They did not want to take the embargo off despite that pledge. A conference was appointed, presided over by Viscount Findlay. Mr. Tolmie, now Prime Minister of British Columbia, was really responsible for the presentation of the case—a case never more admirably presented anywhere, according to the authorities who heard it submitted. Then the claim to remove the embargo was pressed, and strange as it may sound, Mr. Prothero, then Baron Ernle, in the House of Lords said that no pledge had been given and it would be disastrous to England to remove the embargo. He took that view. Viscount Birkenhead was then chancellor, and he took a strong position with respect to that pledge. Then the Duke of Devonshire spoke and said: "All I can say is this, that the Canadian people believed, when Sir Robert Borden and Mr. Rogers returned, that the pledge meant that the word of England was given that the embargo would be taken off, and we must remove it." Then Viscount Long of Wraxall reviewed the whole case and said, "Even though it involves hardship our pledge must be kept". In the Commons the same thing transpired; and despite the fact that a desperate effort was made to prevent that embargo being taken off, the pledge was implemented. But the atmosphere was not