## CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

#### OFFICIAL REPORT

### Friday, April 20, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

#### MINES AND MINERALS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the name of Mr. Kennedy (Edmonton) be substituted for that of Mr. Shaw as a member of the select standing committee on Mines and Minerals.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the House. Motion agreed to.

#### PRIVATE BILLS

#### FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 113 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Burgess.—Mr. Hocken.
Bill No. 114 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Wesley Scott.—Mr. Chew.

#### ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend subsection one of section six of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, chapter seventy-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by section one of chapter seven of the statutes of 1922, and to provide that the words "two hundred dollars for each head of cattle" in the eighteenth line thereof be stricken out and be replaced by the words "one hundred and fifty dollars for each head of cattle"; to further provide that this act come into operation on the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, and that the minister may order compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered on or after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-two, but which had been valued and ordered to be slaughtered prior to that date, at the rates authorized by statute before the coming into force of said chapter seven; also to provide that the minister may order compensation for animals which may be slaughtered on or after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, but valued and ordered to be slaughtered from the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-two to the thirtieth June, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, both dates inclusive, at the rates authorized by chapter seven of the statutes of 1922.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the usual resolution which precedes a money bill and while it was discussed incidentally a few weeks ago I think it is well to go into it further at this time. The main feature of the resolution proposes to reduce the indemnity for slaughtered animals, that is pure breds, from \$200 for each head to \$150. Our reason for doing that is to conform to the general reduction of values in live stock, both commercial and pure bred. The first amount is the rate that was given for compensation during the war, but we now think we have come to pre-war prices both in regard to pure bred and commercial animals. Therefore, we are restoring the rate that prevailed immediately before the war. I may say that the estimates for this year are based upon this lower valuation.

The effect of the balance of the resolution is this: Last year when we made a similar reduction in the amount of compensation for slaughtered animals, the law being brought into force on the first of July, it was found that a great injustice was done to the owners of those animals that were appraised before that date. For instance a farmer, we will call him Jones if you like, had his animals appraised, say, on the 20th June by the government inspector. He might have had a dozen animals and a valuation was agreed upon between the inspector and the owner of the animals under which he expected, we will say, a compensation of \$2,000 for the entire number. The inspector went away and the farmer returned home feeling that that was what he was entitled to. The new law came into force on the first of July before any of Jones animals were slaughtered and then the new scale of compensation came into force. Consequently if the government and the government inspectors are to keep faith with that farmer his compensation must be based upon the valuation which took place any time before the first of July. I may say that when I was in Edmonton last summer I met a number of farmers who found they were exactly in this position: They had the certificate of the government inspector assuring them that they would get compensation based upon the act in force prior to last July. Then the new act