Mr. Cruickshank: As I understand it cattle, pigs and chickens are all taken into it. I thought this was foot-and-mouth disease. What I am trying to get at is this, that we were hoodwinked in British Columbia because of inefficiency in connection with the Newcastle disease, and we are not going to have the same inefficiency in the foot-and-mouth disease. I have asked how many cattle were paid for to the stockyards or the packing companies-the total amount-and also how much was paid to the farmers, and the number of cattle involved. If that information is not available it just proves my argument as to the inefficiency of certain officials. I would like to have an answer.

Mr. Fraser: That is a Liberal government.

Mr. Cruickshank: No, it is not; it is inefficient officials.

Mr. Gardiner: If my hon. friend would listen to the answers to the questions which have already been given, and pay attention to what is going on in the house, he would not need to ask questions. I have already answered his question three times, and I do not think I should be asked to answer it again.

Mr. Cruickshank: Mr. Chairman, I take exception to that remark, and I will answer it. I did not intend to get into this; but when I am told to pay attention—and in the light of the fact that I lost more money, personally, through the inefficiency of officials, than any one of those officials ever owned in his life—I say that when I lost that money, personally, and the minister then tells me that I am not paying attention, I resent it very much. I ask for an answer, and if he cannot give it, it just proves—

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Cruickshank: I will sit down for nobody. Every dairy farmer in the Fraser valley lost money in this, and I say that if the minister's officials cannot answer, then there is inefficiency somewhere. I have asked a question as to how much was paid to the packing companies, and how many head of cattle were paid for. Then I asked how much was paid to the farmers, and how many stock. Surely the minister has an answer—and I want to know what it is.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Chairman, I have already said that I can get that answer, but I have not got it. I can send out and get it, however. But I do not think the answer, in the form in which it is sought, is going to be very helpful to anyone. However, if the hon. member insists upon having it, then I will get it, although it may take two or three hours to get it out in the form he is asking. If he insists I shall try to get the average each

Supply-Agriculture

farmer got for his livestock of different kinds. But I do not know that that information would be very helpful even after we got it.

The facts given were to this effect, that there were 1,061 head of cattle; and it is obvious that out of that number there would be very few contained in the \$3,357.20, which was obtained by a packing plant.

Mr. Cruickshank: What is that last figure?

Mr. Gardiner: It is \$3,357.20. Then, if you take the average price of steers at around \$300, it works out to about ten steers. However, it might be twelve, or some other figure close to that. It would be approximately that number. Now, that is out of 1,061; and the remainder of the 1,061 belonged to the farmers. They were slaughtered, and the intention is to pay for them. Practically all the swine, if not all, would belong to farmers, and the same with the sheep. As I stated before the one goat belonged to the Roughriders football team.

Mr. Cruickshank: How many swine? Knowing the parliamentary assistant to the Regina football team we can appreciate that joke; but how many swine?

Mr. Gardiner: 127.

Mr. Cardiff: If my memory serves me correctly the minister said some 78 head were shot at the abattoirs. Now he says there were only about ten. I cannot say exactly where that is in *Hansard*, but I remember the minister making that statement. Now we are voting \$3,000, which would represent only ten or twelve head.

Mr. Gardiner: I am very sorry; my hon. friend is correct. My eyes were not following a straight course across this page. I apologize to my hon. friend from Fraser Valley, the total amount that Burns got was \$21,308.

Mr. Cruickshank: I am going to be rather fussy about this, in order that the record may be kept straight. The minister said he apologized to the hon. member, and I want it clear that he meant the hon. member for Fraser Valley, because I knew what I was talking about.

Mr. Harkness: I do not know why the minister should make any mystery about what the people have been paid for the animals that have been slaughtered. He started by saying he could give us this bulk figure of \$311,000, or something like that; then a little later we were told that \$700 had been paid, as he remembered it, as the top price for a purebred animal that was slaughtered. I would ask the minister if it