

his government, and which has been endorsed by every government during the last thirty years.

Mr. CAHAN: But is that not the voluntary preference, so-called by the hon. gentleman, which has not been reciprocated throughout those thirty years?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is where I differ entirely from my hon. friend. My hon. friend knows the figures with respect to trade between this country and Britain. He knows that Britain has been Canada's best customer and he knows that Britain has bought year after year more of Canadian goods than we have bought of British goods. Does he mean to say that none of that has been the result of the attitude which Canada has taken and which was so admirably explained by—

Mr. CAHAN: She never bought one dollar's worth of goods unless they could be bought cheaper in Canada than elsewhere.

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask a question of the leader of the opposition? Does not the right hon. gentleman believe that the Prime Minister made a great mistake in not taking the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) to the old country with him?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I answer my hon. friend still further: there is another form of preference which is just as important as a tariff preference, and that is what is termed an administrative preference. What was the position when the former Liberal government came into office with respect to the shipment of cattle to Britain? Cattle were excluded from the British market due to an embargo which had been in force for some years. One of the first acts of the then High Commissioner for Canada in London, the Hon. Peter Larkin, acting under instructions from the government of the day, was to take up with the British government the repeal of that embargo against Canadian cattle. Our argument was in part on the score that when Canada had given to Britain a preference in her market, it was unfair for Britain to continue that embargo against Canada. The embargo was removed and Canadian cattle were given entrance to the British market, not as a result of bargaining, but as a result of a courteous attitude taken towards Britain, in our interests as much as her own, an attitude which was reciprocated in a courteous way. I am not surprised at my hon. friend of all men not understanding the effect of courtesy because he is one of the most courteous gentlemen I know.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. CAHAN: I intended to be courteous to the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULLINS: Does the right hon. gentleman not know that the embargo was off before Mr. Larkin ever reached England?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is mistaken. I happen to know it was not off. I happen to know the instructions given to Mr. Larkin and the proceedings that took place.

Mr. MULLINS: I was in Great Britain when the matter came up before the House of Commons and the right hon. gentleman has no right to take the credit to himself for having the embargo removed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I maintain the accuracy of what I have just said, but whether it was off or not does not affect my argument; my point remains the same, that if the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite had prevailed, the embargo would not have been off yet. There would have been no result; but because there had been a preference given voluntarily to Britain in our markets, so there was an additional reason afforded the British government that finally helped the entrance there of our cattle. If I am not mistaken, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) within the last two weeks has been taking up with the British government some questions with regard to the provisions to be laid down concerning the shipment of cattle to Great Britain. If he expects to get his requests met, is it to be as a result of bargaining which will exclude British commodities from this country. May I say further: there may be voluntary preferences; there may be administrative preferences; there may be tariff preferences, but inter-imperial negotiation has been in large part the result of voluntary preferences.

Let me ask my hon. friend this question: What is occurring in the Argentine republic to-day? What is the significance of all that British officials are doing in the Argentine? Argentine has sought to create an atmosphere favourable to a market for Argentine wheat in Britain. Britain has taken an attitude in response to that taken by the Argentine people towards her, namely: If you are prepared to trade with us, we are prepared to trade with you. Why is there in respect to trade a closer drawing together of the Argentine republic and Britain—the sale of wheat on the one hand and the sale of commodities on the other—while there is not the same drawing together of this country and Great Britain? My right hon. friend wants everything as the result of bargaining on a basis