

route is not a good one, but that eradication of the disease is what we must seek to achieve.

If this is the case, the amount of compensation must be sufficient to encourage stockowners to support the eradication program. To offer the owner of a good herd \$500 per animal, when some of those animals may be very valuable breeding stock worth several thousand dollars, is not to encourage cattlemen to support the eradication program. I know that the government's approach to this problem is to suggest that owners of valuable breeding stock take out insurance against disease. Let me get my lick in by saying that is a good idea if the government will provide the insurance arrangement, but to leave it on an ad hoc or helter-skelter basis, I suggest, will not solve the problem, especially when such insurance is very costly or perhaps not even available.

I gathered from the remarks of the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe that his party will support the bill generally, and in fact that most of the details are acceptable. I agree with him that there needs to be a good deal more discussion in the standing committee about the rates of compensation for slaughtered animals, and I hope such discussion will take place. I join the hon. member, on behalf of my party, in supporting the eradication route with regard to brucellosis as better than the vaccination route. But if we expect the farmers to join in supporting such a program, I believe we shall have to do a lot better than this legislation provides in respect of providing compensation. With those few remarks, I am happy to indicate that this party will be voting for second reading on Bill C-28.

● (1250)

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on Bill C-28, the amendments to the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. This bill has been on the order paper for over a year now and I think it is important that it be dealt with now. This is very important legislation. As previous speakers have mentioned, its predecessor was one of the first acts passed by the new parliament shortly after confederation in 1869.

**An hon. Member:** Stanley Knowles should know.

**Mr. Foster:** There is an important change in the name of the act which reflects the change in direction. I refer to the change from an act of parliament that was essentially introduced on the premise of contagious diseases to one which deals with other aspects such as the protection of animals, especially during transportation.

As I understand it, the control and regulation of the shipping of animals has been limited in the past by a section in the Criminal Code which specifies that every 36 hours animals must be unloaded, rested, fed and watered. However, there is no provision under this act or through the Health of Animals Branch of the Department of Agriculture to control transportation of animals. However, there has been co-operation by the transportation companies with the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture in exercising control in this regard. Important research studies have been carried out in regard to transportation and the results of those studies which are still being carried out will be reflected in the new regulations

#### *Animal Contagious Diseases*

which will be written when these amendments are passed. This really adds another important dimension to the regulation and control in respect of the health of animals moving from the narrow limits of contagious diseases into the matter of the protection of animals, especially during transportation.

I am not sure people in this country fully appreciate the importance of our animal contagious diseases control program as it is carried out by the Health of Animals Branch of the Department of Agriculture. In 1973, over 120 countries received either live animals or animal products worth some \$700 million that were stamped "Canada Approved". This stamp indicates approval by our veterinarian inspectors under the authority of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. It became apparent to a recent parliamentary delegation which recently visited Cuba that perhaps the most important trading link Canada has with that country is the exportation and importation of many thousands of dairy cattle. This has improved Cuba's whole economic situation and the nutritional position of that country. The co-operation in this regard, I must say, is very much appreciated. Other countries such as Ceylon or Sri Lanka have benefited because of co-operative programs involving exchange of our professionals and information, as well as the supplying of a veterinarian college to Ceylon several years ago.

Few Canadians are aware of the fact that we have two quarantine stations in the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. There is one at Grosse Isle and one at St. Pierre Island. At these two points we regularly inspect and carry out a quarantine program in respect of the importation of cattle from other countries, especially western Europe. This involves the breeds that are not so familiar to us here in Canada. In this way we are in a position to test these animals and bring them in with an assurance that really serious diseases such as foot and mouth disease will not infect our Canadian livestock. At the same time, we have an opportunity to bring these breeds in for breeding purposes and thereby improve our general livestock population.

It seems to me there are three or four important aspects of this bill. One is transportation. Another is the change relating to compensation and the technical changes that are applied in this bill. I have already mentioned the important changes that are proposed to control transportation of animals. Surely, it is more appropriate that these be carried out under the Department of Agriculture than under the Department of Justice, and the Criminal Code.

I should like to refer briefly to the compensation sections which the hon. member, my colleague in the veterinary profession, the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) has mentioned. He referred to the importance of this change in the compensation program and that it will be more adequate for ensuring that the agricultural community is adequately compensated for animals which must be slaughtered. I think the present system provides that the livestock owner who has an animal which is condemned for slaughter receives a fixed amount plus the salvage value of the animal that has been ordered to be slaughtered. This creates inequities, because if the animal is slaughtered and the meat is suitable for human consumption, the farmer receives a fixed amount plus the