

*Animal Contagious Diseases*

value of the animal, but if the animal is condemned he merely receives the flat compensation amount.

Mr. Speaker, I see it is one o'clock. Perhaps I could call it one o'clock.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. Foster:** Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned for lunch I was talking about the compensation provisions under Bill C-28. The present method of compensation for livestock owners who have animals which are condemned because of disease provides a fixed amount of compensation. In some cases, on top of this the owner is able to realize the salvage value of the animal. However, this varies a great deal depending on the circumstances and whether the animal can go for food purposes or whether it has to be condemned for food purposes. Under the bill before the House, the livestock owner will be compensated to the fair market value. It seems to me that this method of compensation is much more fair to the livestock owner.

Also, there is provision in the bill for compensation for fodder or feed which has to be destroyed because of the diseased condition of the animals on the premises. I think the committee should look at other aspects when a complete herd must be depopulated and income is curtailed for short periods of time. This is something which requires much more study, but I think the committee will want to look at the idea of making provision for this in the act. At some time in the future it may be deemed advisable to write regulations in this regard. That is not to say that the livestock owners do not have a responsibility. It seems to me that they have a responsibility, when purchasing animals, to take adequate precautions related to sanitation and disease.

Good assistance is available from the Health of Animals Branch with regard to the testing of samples of blood or whatever biologic is used to examine the animal for disease. The bill also clarifies many parts of the existing act which perhaps are not as clear as they should be in light of the existing health programs and disease control programs which are now in effect in the country today. These relate to the designation of areas for disease control. There is further clarification of definitions such as concerning animals, birds, bees and domestic animals which are covered by this act, as well as veterinary biologics which have been covered previously, but the terminology is further outlined.

I think one of the important parts of this bill relates to the section concerning deadyards and rendering plants. In the past year we have had a great deal of publicity in this country concerning dead animals which were diseased finding their way back to the human food chain. This bill makes provision for the regulation of deadyards and rendering plants right to the construction, operation and

[Mr. Foster.]

maintenance of animal deadyards and rendering plants and the regulating of packing and marking of products of deadyards and rendering plants. Surely this is a very important addition to our health of animals program and further identifies the reason for changing the name of the bill, which refers to animal and human protection, as well as the infectious aspect of the bill.

Another aspect which is covered by the bill is the regulation and control of semen for artificial insemination purposes. Surely this is a very important aspect of Canada's export program. I understand that two million vials of semen are exported to some 30 different countries each year. It is important that there be control of diseases which might be spread in this manner.

● (1410)

I think it is important to recognize how much progress has been made in the control of disease in humans and animals because of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act over the years. Some 40 years ago, the program for control of bovine tuberculosis was initiated and it has been very successful in controlling the disease in cattle and in humans, too, because the disease often came from the reservoir within domestic animals.

In the past few years, a great deal of progress has been made in the control of brucellosis in cattle. This is called undulant fever in humans. In 1951, 8 per cent to 10 per cent of our cattle population was infected with brucellosis, with an annual loss, in terms of milk and calves aborted, of some \$9 million. By 1956, as a result of the vaccination program, infection from brucellosis in the cattle population was reduced to 4.5 per cent. The test and slaughter program started in 1957 and the first testing was completed by 1966. The effect of the program can be seen in the reduction of the infection to .2 per cent of the total cattle population of 15 million. This is a dramatic success story.

As one who was engaged in the practice of veterinary medicine when the program was introduced, I must say I was a Doubting Thomas. I did not think a disease as infectious as brucellosis could be handled so effectively through a test and slaughter program, as tuberculosis had been in previous decades. That is not to say that we do not have infected herds in Canada today; obviously, with a .2 per cent rate, there are still some. It seems to me that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) and his advisers in the Health of Animals Branch will have to decide in the next year or so whether to go completely for the test and slaughter program or continue with vaccination.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) support the idea of the complete elimination of the Calflod vaccination program. I think this is the direction we should move in, and that the continued vaccination, although it may be encouraging and useful to the individual cattle owner, is not as useful in the over-all picture of disease control in Canada. Continued vaccination only complicates the testing procedure and masks infection in animals. I hope in the next year or so the government will move to discontinue the vaccination program which some provinces still encourage. If we do eliminate vaccination, I think we will have to provide a more extensive compensation program, especially when a