

Supply—Agriculture

to take effect from the date the regulation becomes effective or will it be retroactive? During the war there was a period when the testing of cattle for T.B. was practically at a standstill because so many of the men who were capable of doing that work were in the army. During that same period the price of cattle increased, particularly good dairy cows, to such an extent that the compensation paid prior to that time is not adequate. I should like to have the minister bring us up to date on this whole question.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Chairman, the answer today is the same as it was a year ago. About ten per cent of the cattle that are reactors go into the tank. The increased price of cattle does not hurt the man who is being paid compensation unless there is a large proportion of the animal infected because it is only then that it goes into the tank. If an animal is worth \$200 this year and it was worth only \$50 ten years ago the compensation is on the same basis, but the remainder of the animal is sold and the individual gets the return. If his return is based on the \$200 price he may get the greater part of the \$200 and he gets the compensation as well. It is not correct to say that because the price has gone up on cattle the compensation ought to go up. The compensation is not the whole thing.

A year ago there was considerable discussion, and I think properly so, of the fact that ten per cent of the cattle did go into the tank, and that compensation was not high enough for these animals when we simply paid the amount that we were required by law to pay. We brought in a bill to change the law. I think I introduced it into the house but it did not get any further than the introduction by the time the house was dissolved. In answer to a question the other day, I said that as far as I knew the same bill would come back again, and I have had assurance since that time that the legislation which did get to that stage last year, which passed council, was agreed to and reported to this house, is coming back. Only today I signed the bill and sent it on its regular course by which it will get into this house. That bill does provide that we pay the full compensation on animals which have gone into the tank. It is made retroactive to April 1, 1947. That is the way the bill was drawn last session, and it was drawn after full discussion with different areas concerned. The bill will be brought down in the same form. I do not think it will be changed in any word or letter. I presume it will go through the house. As soon as it does, money will be made available. Supplementary estimates will be brought down in order to take care of the expenditure in addition to what is in these regular estimates. The reason the estimates are not greatly increased

in relation to that problem is that the amount of money necessary to deal with it is not yet before the house because the legislation has not been passed by the house.

May I now deal with the question as to how many were slaughtered in Middlesex. I hold in my hand the information with regard to Middlesex. There are four headings which read as follows. The first heading is "Herds." The second heading is "Cattle." The third heading is "Reactors." The fourth heading is "Infected Herds", and the last column is "Amount of money paid in compensation." As applied to Middlesex the first figure is 2,931; the second figure, which is the one the hon. member is interested in, is 54,523. The number of reactors is 8,619. The number of herds affected is 1,274; and the amount of compensation paid is \$317,905. That is the full total with regard to Middlesex.

Mr. Blair: Will the minister give the figures for Lanark in the last test, based on the Middlesex figures?

Mr. Gardiner: There is a difference between Lanark and Middlesex, in that three tests have been made in Lanark and only one in Middlesex, which would make the figures not comparable as between the two areas. The first figure in Lanark in the third general test is 1,776, but the important fact is that there were 35,219 cattle tested and 106 reactors from 39 herds. The total amount paid is quite small as compared with the other, only \$3,695. They had been cleaned up pretty well in the first two tests and the number that reacted in the third test was quite small.

Mr. Blair: There were 106 reactors in 39 herds. The minister has not the figures for the 1,776 herds?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes. That is the total out of 1,776 herds. Those were the reactors in the 39 herds in the third test. I think that is as it should be if the test is working. Clean up most of them the first time, clean up more the second, and there are not so many left the third time.

Mr. White (Middlesex East): The minister has just mentioned that in the second test a much smaller number of cattle are found as reactors. The reason I journeyed to Toronto yesterday was to see this herd slaughtered. On the first test only three were found to be reactors. On the second test 44 were found to be reactors. That led to some doubt in the minds of people in my constituency as to just what was going on. But I want to say to the minister and to others that I saw 33 of the carcasses butchered yesterday and I am satisfied that on that test no mistake was made so far as these