

*Government Orders*

as undulant fever, are a couple of the categories of disease.

As a result, the department has been conducting vaccination inoculation programs at one time or another. That continues with rabies. It was abandoned with brucellosis because of some detection problems that the vaccination program created. We have moved to an eradication of the disease type of program for TB and brucellosis.

These programs often appear to be controversial. The public, sometimes including the farming public, does not fully understand the need for the rather radical methods that are used to achieve control and eradication of these very important diseases to the human population as well as animal population. Sometimes it stirs up controversy when a whole herd is disposed of when brucellosis and tuberculosis are found.

This act permits some procedures which have been tried and which would assist the department to contain the disease without always going to those methods. Generally speaking, eradication is still the best method. I raise this in the House now even though there is not a great deal of public attention on it. We have a herd of hybrid bison in northern Alberta close to the territorial border which is infected with these two diseases.

As far as veterinary medical science is aware, there is no other way to get rid of that disease but to use the eradication program.

Unfortunately, a lot of well-meaning environmentalists think that that is too strong a response to disease control but, as a person who raises animals domestically I realize, and I have seen it happen very close to me, that the only way to obtain that kind of control for the health of humans and for the other animals in the area, in this case it affects humans just as readily as the other livestock in the area, is eradication. It is the only route to pursue and it does work.

This bill permits the control by those methods. For the herds that are wiped out, they always consider the compensation package to be inadequate because it is a big disruption. Often production is disrupted for two full years, and that kind of compensation is never provided. Sometimes, for particular individual animals that are purebred and have particular genetic qualities, the farmer sells them, provided he gets the kind of price that he has invested. However, this is the way the system

works. There has been a move in this act to try to permit larger payments, but it still will not give full compensation for some of the very valuable animals that have to be disposed of, should they become infected one way or another.

That is why we are trying to keep inspections at the borders more secure. Our inspection system has always been very good, but we are hopeful that this bill will permit even more flexibility and permit the borders to become even more secure.

That also raises some of the issues that are proposed in this legislation that some of us have a few doubts about. We permit the passages that allow the Minister of Agriculture to achieve a certain amount of cost recovery because, in some instances, it does make some sense. The service that is being provided by the department is of direct economic benefit to the user.

For instance, if I were to import breeding stock from another country, I would feel quite comfortable about paying the costs of leaving that animal in quarantine for the required amount of time. I am expecting to gain something from the importation of that animal, and this is a part of a cost of my doing business, introducing this new genetic stock to the country.

As well, laboratory testing for genetic abnormalities is an industry advantage. It is an advantage to the person submitting the genetic material for test. I do not think anyone in the industry has a great deal of problem with paying for those kinds of tests that are done by Agriculture Canada laboratories. When we get into disease testing which is for the public good, I think that those costs should continue to be borne by the public and be paid for out of departmental funds. I think most Canadian consumers would agree because it is their assurance that those tests will be done on their behalf, if they are done by officials of the Government of Canada.

As well, if we are exporters or importers, the buyer has assurance that the imported product or the exported product has been properly tested and monitored for disease control. The transmission of pests and any that might act as vectors which would carry any disease would be carefully monitored. We heard in testimony that a great many importing countries look with a jaundiced eye at imports from countries where the private sector is permitted to do this type of testing and provide a stamp or signature on the export papers.