

farmers how easy it was to accomplish this object if they only had business men at the head of the government. Well, the country made a change, and as soon as the new government came in they tried to get the embargo removed. They have been in power nine years, and have not made any great headway. They claim that everything has now been done that it is possible to do; nevertheless, the embargo on Canadian cattle still remains.

Well now at least he ought to admit that he is not able to accomplish any more than the Conservative government before him notwithstanding all the ability which he has represented to the Canadian people he possesses. These were the contentions that were put up. To-day we are passing this resolution. It is a report from the Committee on Agriculture. I agree with the report, if it accomplishes any good, but I am afraid it will not accomplish what we desire. But if it does accomplish that desire, I shall be very much gratified and I agree with my hon. friend that we cannot have it brought to the attention of the English people an hour too soon. But, there is another phase of the matter that is rather interesting and amusing to me. When the question was discussed by the Committee on Agriculture, quite a while ago, a delay was asked until we could have another phase of the question brought to the attention of the committee, but it was declared that it could not be kept waiting an hour or a day because it was important to have it reported to the House at once and to have the report concurred in by the House and sent across to the old country immediately. However, it was only presented to the House on the 26th of June and now on the 7th July we are moving for the adoption of the report. There does not appear to be such urgent need to hurry it up now notwithstanding the fact that it was represented to us in committee that it would be unwise to retain it a day or two longer. There was, therefore, not such urgent need as would justify the committee in pushing it through in such haste. The parties who have this matter in charge declared that the contentions which were put up were so valuable that they must take action in regard to them immediately, but they have not shown by their conduct that they really think them so valuable as they claimed them to be. What does the report say? It declares that this is a great injustice to Canada. I agree with that. This embargo, we believe, has been imposed under false pretenses. They pretend that there is danger of importing disease from Canada whereas that disease has never existed in Canada and it could not be imported from this country. It is an injustice to us because it is practically telling the whole world not to take cattle from Canada for breeding purposes because there is danger of importing disease. The British Board of

Mr. SPROULE.

Agriculture says: We will not allow cattle from Canada landed in Great Britain to remain for more than ten days because within that time they must be slaughtered at the port of entry. We think that is an injustice to the Canadian people. We have endeavoured to ascertain the reason for keeping on this embargo. We believe that this is entirely a protective measure in the interest of the British farmer and nothing more, and that the English people, who are not protectionists in principle, are afraid to admit that it is a measure of protection. Therefore, we are unjustly dealt with, it is done under false pretenses and it is a great injustice to Canada. My hon. friend from St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) said that there is no element of sentiment in John Bull's nature and that with him business is business from start to finish. Well, I think he is pretty correct in that. If the English people have an object in view they endeavour to carry it out. However, I want also in connection with that to refer for a moment to the trip of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to England in connection with this question. He went over there to look after the interests of the farmers of Canada and when he was pressing the suit of the preference we have given to England we were entitled to a preference in the market of the motherland. But, what did the hon. Minister of Agriculture say? What he said was published in the papers and marked copies were sent over to Canada. I know that because I got one. He declared that we wanted nothing at all from England, that what we had given her we had given of our own free will, voluntarily and that we asked nothing in return. That is not business. My principle is, like John Bull's, if you give anything to any one you ought to get something in return. I think it was the duty of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to show what Canada has done and what Canada is doing for the British people, and in view of this consideration to ask that some concessions be made in favour of Canada. I regard that as a very proper and legitimate argument to present to the British people, and I do not think our Minister of Agriculture or our Finance Minister exemplified the highest type of statesmanship or business when they went over to England and said: What we have given we have given freely of our own motion and we do not ask anything in return. If I allow neighbours to cross my farm by a special route that makes it easy and convenient for them when I will not grant that privilege to the general public, if I have done something for my neighbours that I have not done for the general public and if I ask them to reciprocate that kindness by doing something, for me I would expect them to do it. I would expect some return from