herds for tuberculosis. It is one of the diseases that menaces not only our dairy herds but also the people as well—possibly being transmitted largely through dairy products and the meat of the beef animal. Although I am a breeder of pure-bred stock myself I see no great objection to reducing the indemnity. In fact, as far as I am personally concerned, I would be willing to forego the indemnity for condemned animals if the testing of herds is carried on—that is, if it is necessary to discontinue the indemnity in order to carry on the testing for tuberculosis, I would rather see that take place than discontinue the testing.

With regard to the limitation as to the number of animals, I would also like to urge upon the minister not to put this restriction on the man with less than ten pure-bred animals. For example, in the province from which I come we are just beginning in the pure-bred stock line of business. A great many men there have less than ten head of purebred cattle; we are simply beginning to change our methods of farming there, of going into mixed farming and keeping more cattle. A man who is buying pure-bred cattle to-day will not buy from a herd that is not tested. This handicaps a man who has less than ten cattle while his neighbour who, perhaps, is in a better position to carry on stock breeding, or has been at it longer, has the advantage of having his herd tested. I would urge very strongly on the minister to continue the policy of testing cattle for tuberculosis.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince P.E.I.): I would like to support what the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. has just said, the same thing applies to cattle in the province of Prince Edward Island. We have a number of small breeders there and this restriction, I think, would be very hard on them. The small breeder would be prevented from having his cattle properly tested and thereby, possibly, lose the sale of his stock. I am also thoroughly in favour of good grade cattle being given the benefit of testing the same as pure-bred stock. Has a veterinary inspector employed by the Department of Agriculture the privilege of charging the man who applies to have his cattle tested a fee in addition to the regular salary which is paid to him?

Mr. McBRIDE: Hon. members have spoken in connection with the restriction of the number of cattle entitled to be tested to ten, but no one has given any reason why the owners of four or five head—should not bring their cattle together and have them tested at the same time. Some years

ago there was supposed to be scurvy among the cattle in the district in which I lived. The man who was to inspect gave us notice when he would arrive and when he came out we had at least 3,000 head of cattle gathered together for him to inspect. Why should the people not help the government in this respect, get the cattle together, notify the inspector and have them inspected at the same time? I see no reason why they should not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A certain amount of co-operation between these people and the government officials is being undertaken. When we get three or four cattle together, we test them; even if there are only two we test them. I am disposed to accept smaller herds than ten. I think we can cut that figure in two, and perhaps economize in some other way, and help to make up for the additional expense, especially if a little preparation is made, as suggested by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride).

Just running over a few memoranda I have taken, I recall that I was reported as almost making the remark attributed to me by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. What I intended to say, at all events, was that the higher the indemnity, naturally the higher the appraisement would be. There was no question about that. The higher the maximum valuation was permitted in the statutes. the higher the appraisement would be by the veterinarians. That is so logical that it is not necessary to demonstrate it at all. There is another feature about it, and that is that with the natural good-nature and sympathetic attitude of any man who has a heart towards the man who owns the cattle, he will be sufficiently desirous of doing the last thing for the man, without putting up the possible valuation higher than we desire, and I have to thank my hon, friend for taking the moderate view he takes on this occasion. One of the reasons for the shortage of last year's estimate was due to the fact that it was based upon a smaller valuation than finally decided upon in this House. My estimate of the shortage was about \$50,000. As a farmer myself, looking at it from the farmer's standpoint, some years ago I naturally would look for as high an appraisement in reason as I could get, but, having to administer the act and being confined to a certain fixed amount of money with which to take care of the work, I can see that if you go beyond a certain point you do not get the maximum results with the minimum amount of money. Furthermore, if you give too high an appraisement there is a temptation on the part of the man to be careless