

Mr. BENTLEY: This was a case where a person, I think, sprayed a certain material on some very valuable bulls and there was a court case over it. The difficulty here was that perhaps he did not conform with the regulations which he was supposed to follow in the spraying of these cattle.

Mr. BALDWIN: Am I right that action was brought and that a judgment was recovered against the municipality and against the company which produced and sold the drug as well as the farmer?

Mr. BENTLEY: I believe there was a judgment, but I think possibly what happened was the agricultural service board in that particular municipality may have had something to do either with the application or with the selling of this particular product, and that may be why they became involved.

Mr. BALDWIN: Are there now certain regulations with regard to taking out these drugs and signing?

Mr. BENTLEY: The result has been that the agricultural service boards now are very reluctant to give any advice or information of any kind, because they are scared to death that they may involve the municipality in a lawsuit. I think this is unfortunate, but it may be the end result. They probably have been told by their superiors not to give any advice of any kind with regard to some of these products.

Mr. BALDWIN: There is no legislation in Alberta similar to that mentioned in respect of the province of Manitoba?

Mr. BENTLEY: I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we leave this particular subject, I think there is a gentleman from one of the federal departments who might have something to say on this matter.

Mr. W. S. MCLEOD (*Supervisor, Pesticide Unit, Department of Agriculture*): The case referred to is sometimes called the case of the poisoned bulls. The suit was brought by a farmer named Mirza Pack against Oliver Chemical Company, Lethbridge, the District of Warner in Alberta, and the foreman of the spray crew, Dwayne Michelson. The case was heard and judgment was brought against the defendants. The case was appealed this fall and the judgment is now pending. Is there further information I could give you in respect of this case? This was an application of an insecticide directly to the breeding bulls for the control of lice. It does not have any impact on the production of milk.

Mr. BALDWIN: Did the Alberta government take any action following this? I thought there was something whereby the farmers who use these pesticides now have to sign a form and accept full responsibility.

Mr. MCLEOD: For at least the year 1963 and possibly even 1962 farmers purchasing dieldrin for the control of grasshoppers were required to sign a declaration that they had read the directions for the use of this chemical, and that they would use the chemical as directed.

Mr. BALDWIN: They would sign this before they could obtain the chemical?

Mr. MCLEOD: This is my understanding.

Mr. NESBITT: For which chemicals that are of a noxious nature and likely to get into milk is the testing made? I gather that dieldrin is one. In respect of what other chemicals do they test?

Mr. BENTLEY: There is treatment for mastitis in cows, and so on, and penicillin, aureomycin, and all these different products may show up in the milk. The regulation requires that 72 hours must elapse before you can use the milk of a cow which has been inoculated for any purpose whatsoever.