

*Supply—Agriculture*

opportunity has been given for an adequate discussion of this serious matter, a matter of which I think the ordinary member does not realize the seriousness.

**Mr. Gardiner:** The only reason I rose on the point of order is that the hon. member who was speaking was not trying to get the kind of information which is now being asked for. The hon. member was making a speech which I think he will agree, as well as all those who were listening to him, was a good political speech. I can make a good political speech if necessary. But that is not going to get the kind of information that is being asked for. If hon. members want information and ask for it I am not going to insist upon a ruling being given that we must stick absolutely to the letter of this vote. But if we are going to start out on a political rampage, I do not intend to join in it tonight unless I have to. If I have to it will only be because it has been ruled that I am not in order in what I have said.

**Mr. Blackmore:** What is the government doing to support prices?

**Mr. Cruickshank:** On the point of order, I disagree completely with the way in which this problem was handled in the past. It has cost me a lot of money and it has cost every farmer in my riding a lot of money.

**Mr. Gibson:** You can stand it.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Therefore I want to ask a question on this point of order.

**Mr. Cardiff:** If the hon. member is speaking on the point of order he is not supposed to ask a question.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Has every provision been made, which I doubt, to prevent the spread of this disease which is ruining the dairy farmers of the Fraser valley?

**The Deputy Chairman:** The hon. member is not speaking on the point of order, he is asking a question of the minister. I think I have heard enough from the parties interested in this matter to be able to make a ruling at this time. I thought I had made a proper ruling when I interrupted the hon. member for Souris. When I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia deal with a similar extraneous question I thought that in all fairness to the hon. member for Souris I should stop him.

I have read over the item and I see that it provides for compensation in connection with the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and the Act for the Control and Extirpation of Foot-and-Mouth Disease, which we passed in this house some time ago. I sent for a copy

of that act which I had just received when the minister raised his point of order. I think the point of order raised by the minister is well taken because this compensation has to do with the slaughter of animals and articles destroyed.

If hon. members wish to discuss the wide problems which have been created by the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, if it is to be a debate similar to the one which we had at the opening of the session, then unanimous consent will have to be given. Hon. members will realize that at this point I am restricted by the rules and I must insist that standing order 58 be adhered to. Part 2 of this standing order reads:

Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Therefore any discussion at this point must relate to compensation to be paid under the two acts referred to.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Mr. Chairman—

**The Deputy Chairman:** I must remind hon. members that my ruling is not debatable. If the hon. member wishes to appeal it, he may do so.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** I should like to speak on the point of order.

**The Deputy Chairman:** The point of order has just been settled by my ruling.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Canada Packers.

**Mr. Argue:** I thank you for your ruling, Mr. Chairman. You have pointed out that this item has been placed in the estimates as a result of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and the Act for the Control and Extirpation of Foot-and-Mouth Disease. This item covers all the money that parliament has so far been called upon to vote as a result of the outbreak of this disease.

I should like to know how much money is being paid to farmers for animals destroyed, and for feed, fodder, buildings or any other articles covered by this act which may have been destroyed. How many animals is the \$311,000 in payment of? How many head of cattle? How many head of hogs? How many horses? How many poultry? How many sheep? How many other animals?

**An hon. Member:** Gophers.

**Mr. Argue:** What representations have been received by the minister in regard to compensation being paid? Do farmers say it is adequate? I would like to know the average payment made per head of cattle slaughtered. I think that single bit of information will