

Supply—Agriculture

Mr. Gardiner: As the chairman has said, the payments are fairly well outlined. The item provides for the payment of compensation to owners of cattle under official supervision which were slaughtered for beef and condemned for tuberculosis on post mortem examination. That is, it was not known that the animals had tuberculosis until they were taken to the packing plant and killed. It lists six different persons who had one animal each in that classification, and the total amount for the cattle was \$521.

In the case of each of the above-mentioned owners his animal was slaughtered for beef and the carcass was condemned for tuberculosis detected upon post mortem examination. The item provided for payment of compensation to owners of cattle affected with diseases coming under the operation of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and which died before the slaughter order could be carried out, as follows. Then there is a list of five individuals. The first two had one animal each, the third had six animals and the other two had one animal each. The total amount there was \$694, and the two amounts total \$1,215.

In the case of each of the above-mentioned owners, his herd was under official supervision. The animals designated above had reacted to the tuberculin test and had been ordered slaughtered under the authority of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act but died before slaughter was carried out; therefore they were paid for as though they had been slaughtered.

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): May I ask another question, Mr. Chairman. Is there any chance of having chronic catarrh brought under this act?

Mr. Gardiner: I am not sure whether there is any chance of it being brought under the act, but it is not under the act at the moment.

Mr. Charlton: The minister has brought up a rather interesting point. Is he saying that if tuberculosis is not diagnosed until after the animal is slaughtered, the payment does not come under the act?

Mr. Gardiner: In these cases it did not. I would not like to say it is not at any time.

Mr. Charlton: It would seem rather strange. Let us suppose that a person had an animal which died on his farm, and afterwards it was proven that it died of tuberculosis. Would he receive compensation then?

Mr. Gardiner: That is what happened in the second group. In the first group the herd was under official supervision. An animal out of that herd was taken to the slaughterhouse and killed. It was not thought to

have tuberculosis, but when it was killed it was found to have it; therefore at least part of the animal was condemned and payment was made then as though the tuberculosis had been found previously. For that reason we have to have a special vote. If it had not been for that we would not require this vote at all.

This is something that cannot go through automatically without bringing it back here. We had to bring it back to the house.

With regard to the other animals, they are of the other classification that has been referred to this evening. In each of these cases the owner's herd was under official supervision. The animals designated had reacted to the tuberculin tests and had been ordered slaughtered under the act, but died before slaughter and therefore the payment was carried out.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Do I understand that those animals in the first category were marketable animals that had tuberculosis, but that the owner was not aware of it?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, I would take it that was the case. They definitely were not declared to have tuberculosis before he took them to the plant and it was found after they got there that they had it.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Would they be steers or cows? There is no indication of that.

Mr. Gardiner: It does not say here whether they were steers or cows, but there is only one in each case.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): I was looking at the particulars. I notice that one amount is \$83, another is \$86, another is \$94 and another \$72. Is that an indication of what livestock were bringing on the market at the time of year these amounts were paid?

Mr. Gardiner: I am not sure whether you are reading the same list I am, unless you have started at the bottom and read up. The top figure on the list I have here is \$119, then \$94, \$40, \$100, \$85 and \$83. The payments are made on the basis of whether they are grades or purebreds. The grades are only paid on a certain percentage, and the limit of the price is stated; but the purebreds are paid on a higher basis.

Mr. Robinson (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister will explain what he means by "under official supervision"? I am sorry to display my ignorance on this point.

Mr. Gardiner: It means that the herd has been tested. The municipality may have been conducting tests or perhaps the county conducted tests, and all the herds in that county