

*Animal Contagious Diseases Act*

have higher payments than those for which provision had been made, in cases where the animal's carcass is entirely destroyed.

Up to that time we just paid on a carcass the amounts mentioned in the bill, whether the carcass was entirely destroyed, or taken to market and a fairly high price received for it. For example, dealing with a case such as has just been referred to, at a time when prices of animals were very much lower, one could buy a registered bull for possibly \$125 or \$150. I bought one for that myself. I had to have him slaughtered because he reacted for t.b. I took him to market and got \$105 for him. In addition to that I could have collected the allowance. Because I was a minister in the government I did not think I should, and so I did not collect that amount. But anyone could have collected it; I could have collected it—the additional amount provided for here. That is another \$100 on top of the \$105, which would have been a reasonable return for that animal. Perhaps under the circumstances that then prevailed, it was a little more than reasonable.

So I suggest that we are proposing here to go ahead on the same basis in connection with diseases of that kind. But in this case, where cholera comes along quite regularly into this country, and does take livestock from our farms, we should be in a position to make higher payments on those hogs and sheep than we have been able to do in the past.

**Mr. Harkness:** I must say I am glad to hear the minister in such good voice. I agree with a considerable amount of what he said. But he still has not answered the question I asked at the beginning. Perhaps I might now put it a little differently.

As I understand this legislation—if I may take an example which I believe is comparable to the one he mentioned—a man goes out and buys an extremely good Yorkshire boar and pays \$1,000 for it. This boar develops hog cholera a month later. As I understand the bill it will be possible to pay that man \$1,000 for that boar? Is that correct? And if the market value as mentioned in the first part of clause 1 is taken, he would be paid that \$1,000.

But, to take the example I took previously, of the man who has paid \$5,000 for a Hereford bull, and it dies a month later from any of these diseases: the most he can collect, as I read the bill, is still the market value of the carcass—which, we will say, is \$150—plus \$100, making \$250 altogether. That is all he can collect, although he has had a more valuable animal than the boar.

It does not seem to me that that is reasonable. The minister says, "We will meet any

of these special circumstances by legislation." As a matter of fact something along these lines can develop when parliament is not in session, when special legislation cannot be passed. What reason is there for not placing those animals on all fours, so far as payments are concerned, cattle, swine, sheep and horses.

I would say at this point that I think the owners most discriminated against are the owners of purebred horses; because, so far as purebred horses are concerned, the maximum that can be paid is \$200 for a purebred animal. A purebred horse of any sort of breed at the present time is worth considerably more than that. They are probably discriminated against to a greater extent than the owners of any other sort of animal.

To keep on the subject of cattle, the minister has not yet answered the question with respect to the suggestion put forward by the parliamentary assistant that the owner of this \$5,000 bull could be compensated more than the value of the carcass, plus \$100 except by special legislation. Is that not the situation? Perhaps I can get an answer to the two or three questions I have asked.

**Mr. Gardiner:** In view of the fact that the hon. member addressed his questions to me in the beginning, and as a result of what I have just said, I would point out that when a breeder buys an animal at a very high price he is not always paying for the animal. There are times when he is paying for good advertising. I have been at sales where animals were being sold and when the price that was paid for the animal was very much higher than would have been paid by the man who bought it had he just been thinking about the animal himself. I would not like to say on the floor of the house that if a case of this kind came up before me as minister I would declare that no matter what the gentleman paid for the animal that he had we would be committed under this bill to pay him that much for it. We would pay him of course what he probably would have been prepared to sell the animal for himself after he had used him for a short time. Many things have to be taken into consideration besides just the fact that he paid that much for the animal, and all those things would be taken into consideration.

**Mr. Harkness:** That is entirely on the question of market value, which the parliamentary assistant said a little while ago was absolutely clear and understood by everybody. As I understand the minister's remarks, the market value is anything but clear. The market value essentially comes down to what the minister, or the person whom he appoints