

They were placed against us because we had a ninety days quarantine against them. We were the aggressors, and why? Because, to hold our free entry into the markets of Great Britain, to secure that market without an embargo being placed against us, we made a solemn compact with Great Britain that we would keep a ninety days quarantine against American cattle. We could have got the quarantine removed at any single moment we liked, but we did not attempt to get it removed, and we did not attempt to get it removed, because we were anxious to keep the compact that secured us a still greater market, the market of Great Britain, which we had the right to enter upon terms which we had obtained some years before, and remember this, Sir, hon. gentlemen never attacked us for keeping that quarantine up against the United States. They attacked us for not making it stricter and more severe. They hounded us because they said we were neglecting it. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman says: I have at last secured this great boon to you, a boon which we could have got in very short time providing we had abandoned the hope of securing the removal of the embargo which was against us in Great Britain. By the way, I may remark here, that, when the Prime Minister was up in the province of Ontario, he told the farmers there that the hon. Minister of Agriculture had got free trade in cattle for them, free entry into the markets of the United States, evidently not knowing the difference between quarantine regulations and duty, the quarantine regulations being removed and the duty still being enforced. There was after the time that I had discussed this subject fully with the Secretary of State for the Colonies and with the Right Hon. Walter Long—the present Minister of Agriculture in England, and I came to the conclusion that if this was a domestic policy, as they said it was, if this was a protective policy, as they really admitted it was, there was no use in demonstrating further, as it had been demonstrated by Sir Charles Tupper and successive ministers of agriculture, that our cattle were perfectly healthy, and just before I left office I instructed the gentleman in charge of the cattle quarantine to enter into correspondence with Dr. Salmon, chief of the quarantine branch in the United States, believing that this policy, being a domestic policy in Great Britain, there was no use of doing anything more in the way of trying to get the embargo removed. In other words, I felt that the time had come that it was useless to try further to get the embargo removed in Great Britain, and that we might better get any advantage we could by lessening the quarantine restrictions. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman boasts of his market. I want to ask hon. gentlemen opposite where the promise is to-day to get the markets in

Mr. MONTAGUE.

the United States for the farmers of the province of Ontario and elsewhere. I do not need to recount these promises. On every platform the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. Minister of Customs and other hon. gentlemen, held the hope up to the farmers of Ontario that: If you put us in power, within six months, yes, within a shorter period, you shall have reciprocity, you shall have free entry of your products into the markets of the United States. What is the result? The result, as I told the House the other night is, no markets, but a bill of \$36,000 for a pleasure trip to Washington and Quebec. What does the hon. member for North Norfolk say now? Once he wept for reciprocity with the United States, once he declared that the government was mean, was unfair, was unstatesmanlike in dealing with the United States. What did he say last night? I take it from his utterance, notwithstanding the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister, that his mind is set against it, and that all hope of reciprocity has disappeared from the hon. gentleman's mind. He says in various places: The United States have been very illiberal, that their treatment of us has been very illiberal, that our treatment of the United States has been too liberal, and that, therefore, he is not in favour of reducing the duty. He says that he is not in favour of reciprocity, because they do not deserve it. And at page 3427 he said:

Everything in connection with the trade policy of the United States, everything in connection with the treatment we received at their hands, points to a narrow, selfish and unfriendly policy.

And then he adds—and I would have expected he would have added to it,—though no member of the government has said it, but it comes with full force from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) because he was a member of the commission:

In our negotiations at Washington we met hostility on every turn, because of the preference we had given to England.

Now let us see just how the hon. gentlemen stood when they went to Washington to get reciprocity. They had given free corn to the United States; they had given away one of the things that we had to trade—they are great at giving things away for nothing in return.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 'There is that that scattereth and yet increaseth.'

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Finance, I have no doubt recognizes to the full the meaning of the quotation which he has just given. He says: There is that which scattereth and still increaseth. That is quite true. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is lavishly scattering the funds of this country with the hope of increasing his term of office. He scatters it especially in