

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In that district they were all completed about five or six weeks ago. I think everything is cleared up in the districts that have complied with the "clean-up" conditions.

Mr. COTNAM: Under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act does the department grant remuneration to farmers who have experienced the loss of cattle suffering from hemorrhagic septicæmia?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That does not come under the Health of Animals branch.

Mr. COTNAM: Is there any way whereby the department can grant remuneration in cases of that kind?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not that I know of.

Mr. KENNEDY: In regard to imports of mutton from New Zealand and elsewhere, is it possible for the Department of Agriculture to arrange that the statistics be kept in such a way that we can tell what quantity of lamb and what quantity of mutton come in? At the present time the whole thing is so jumbled up that one cannot tell what it is.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will try that out.

Item agreed to.

Health of Animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and Meat and Canned Foods Act, and necessary buildings, \$2,450,000.

Mr. BARBER: I wish first to register a protest against the delaying of perhaps the most important estimate until the dying hours of the session. I want to draw to the attention of the committee what I consider a very raw deal that has been handed out to the dairymen of certain sections of the Dominion. I refer to those areas in which the department is carrying on a campaign to eradicate bovine tuberculosis. I do not think any hon. member objects to the action of the department along those lines. We want to clean this up, but the unfairness comes in when the farmers, the dairymen, are called upon to pay about 75 per cent of the cost. I have two complaints to make. The first is the compensation that is allowed, and the second is the delay in payment. As I have said, the compensation is sufficient only to compensate the man for about 25 per cent of the cost of replacement of his herd. This means that the farmers, in order to protect the consumers of milk and in the interest of the public health of the country, are contributing 75 per cent of the cost. In regard to the compensation I cannot hold the minister altogether responsible because the compensation is provided for by statute.

[Mr. B. W. Fansher.]

As perhaps hon. gentlemen are aware, a good grade cow is valued under the act at \$50 and the compensation allowed is \$33.33. It would cost the farmer to replace that cow to-day \$125 to \$150. For pure bred the maximum valuation under the act is \$150, and the compensation two-thirds, or \$100. As far as the Fraser valley is concerned, last year the third test was made in that district, and 286 cattle were slaughtered for which the average compensation, including pure bred, was a little over \$39. This is not sufficient to enable the farmer to replace the cattle in his herd. To increase the compensation it would no doubt be necessary to amend the act. Therefore I cannot hold the minister entirely responsible for the amount of the compensation awarded, but I do hold him directly responsible for the delay in the payment of this compensation. Provision was made in the estimates last year, on the basis of the loss not being over perhaps 1½ per cent; I believe it was under that. But an estimate was made and a sum provided in the estimates. I find to-day that in respect of the cattle slaughtered last October and November the farmers of the Fraser valley were deprived for five or six months of the compensation that was awarded to the amount of \$10,050.30. I consider that the minister is altogether responsible. I have under my hand a letter from a man in my district in which he says:

It seems to be an unfortunate fact that throughout the Fraser valley district, tuberculosis is more or less prevalent. Although it is claimed that the average affected is low—ranging perhaps approximately one per cent of the total dairy cattle—yet in some sections the loss has been heavy and I know of instances in my own district (Matsqui) where some farmers have lost the greater part of their herds. One farmer has lost his entire herd. I have lost eight head out of approximately twenty. The compensation value arbitrarily placed upon these condemned cattle in my herd was \$32 each. I am assuming that other owners of condemned cattle have been promised payment on a similar scale, which is approximately about twenty-five per cent of their commercial replacement value. Cattle were found to be affected by tuberculosis in the opinion of the department's veterinary inspector, and were condemned in October of last year. To date no payment has been made that I can ascertain in our district (Matsqui). It all seems manifestly unfair, particularly as in some instances where the loss of cattle has been great and the entire herd taken the farmer has been left absolutely without means to carry on because he has not the means in the absence of any remittance from the government to even partially replace his dairy herd.

I wish briefly to put this before the government: I think the compensation is too low, and in order to eradicate bovine tuberculosis