

Supply—Agriculture

on which his officials went to the farm of Mr. Rock and examined this flock—

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of order—

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain):—prior to the destruction.

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of order, if the chairman rules that my hon. friend is in order we shall get the information here. It cannot of course be produced on this item. It would not be thought that such a discussion would take place on this item; therefore I have not the information here, but I can get it in a very short time.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I suggest that unless the minister is prepared to get his officials before the committee, and give us the information, these estimates should stand.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Chairman, I should like to have your ruling on the point of order. Are we discussing the general estimates?

The Chairman: As I understand it the hon. gentleman is attempting to discuss a particular case and, as I also understand it, the minister has indicated that this vote has nothing to do with that particular case. If that is correct, if there are no moneys in this vote with regard to the case which the hon. gentleman is attempting to discuss, I must of course rule the discussion out of order.

Mr. Knowles: Before you rule, may I inquire whether what we have before us is a vote that stands on its own feet or is it a vote appropriating more money for the same purpose for which money was appropriated earlier in this fiscal year. I appreciate the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture that my colleague might wait until we get to the main estimates. My fear is that when we get to the main estimates they will be for the year 1957-58, and my colleague will be told that he is talking about something that was in last year's estimates. If this vote is supplementary—

Mr. Pickersgill: If there is no money in this vote for that purpose it is out of order.

Mr. Knowles: It is either out of order or in order.

Mr. Pickersgill: If there is no money in this vote for it, then it is out of order.

Mr. Knowles: If this vote is for additional money for expenditures with regard to the health of animals in this fiscal year, and if my colleague is endeavouring to talk about an expenditure having to do with health of animals in this fiscal year, is this not the place he has to do it?

[Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain).]

The Chairman: Order. The hon. gentleman will find the details of this vote on page 11 of the supplementary estimates. As I understood it the hon. gentleman was trying to discuss the particular case of a person whose name I do not find on this list. Therefore, in these circumstances I do not think the hon. gentleman can argue that the particular discussion is in order.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I might just say that if you so rule, then of course I am out of order; but I should like to point out, sir, that here is an expenditure under the health of animals branch of the Department of Agriculture, and I presume the expenditure that has been made already has been made by the departmental officials in connection with this specific item in this fiscal year. All I am trying to do is to clear up some of the rumours and some of the things that some of us have not been satisfied with.

The Chairman: Order. May I point out that the details appearing on page 11 read as follows:

To provide for the payment of compensation to owners of diseased animals, from herds under official supervision, which died or were slaughtered in circumstances not covered by the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and regulations as follows:

There follow the particulars, names and addresses of the persons, together with particular amounts to be paid which in the aggregate total \$1,215, the amount mentioned in resolution No. 546. Now, unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to discuss one of these items I can do nothing but rule that the discussion is out of order.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): I would just ask this question, Mr. Chairman. Is it not true that expenditures having been made under this item, it is now necessary for the minister to bring in supplementary estimates in order to carry on and make further expenditures in connection with this item? It seems to me it is all part and parcel of the same department, and is under the health of animals branch.

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): No, Mr. Chairman. May I ask one question. This item covers cases that were not covered by the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. I want to ask the minister if there were any cases of chronic catarrh in this list. A few years ago in the Peterborough district we had an outbreak of chronic catarrh which killed off a whole herd valued at some \$5,000 or more. Those animals were not covered; why were these covered?