

*Foot-and-mouth disease*

encouraged in the idea that that was what it was, and that it was not foot-and-mouth disease. But he went in and made a report at Regina to the authorities, which may have been the federal authorities there, and then they checked his farm and that checking has been going on since then.

**Mr. Ross (Souris):** I should like to ask another supplementary question as a result of the minister's statement. He stated that the matter of quarantine should be left with the federal authorities. Many breeders of purebred stock are much concerned over the fact that exhibitions of purebred stock and public sales are billed to take place within the next few weeks at such centres as Brandon, Regina, Calgary and others in the prairies. Would the minister or his officials say that those should be cancelled now? The breeders are really in quite a quandary. Many of them made these entries months ago, but they do not want to deliver their stock under these circumstances and they think that some leadership should be given to them by the federal department as to whether these organizations should proceed with these exhibitions and sales which are billed to commence within a few weeks or whether they should be cancelled.

**Mr. Gardiner:** That is one of the reasons why we are suggesting that matters such as quarantine might be left to the federal authorities. If the disease is confined to a small area—and after all, only twenty-three head of cattle in that area were affected—I think one would find it a little bit difficult to feel otherwise than that it is looking for trouble where trouble might not exist if you start to do something 2,000 miles away from there.

**Mr. Ross (Souris):** It is a few miles from Regina.

**Mr. Gardiner:** Yes, but it is 2,000 miles from where one of these fairs may be held in some part of eastern Canada. I would hesitate to say that everyone who is conducting a fair should close it; but at the same time they may think in Ontario that some animals have been brought into the district that may have carried the disease, and that they would be better without the fair. Where they have that feeling I would not like to say anything that would discourage them from closing up the fair, but at the same time I do not think we should take the responsibility for saying that all these fairs ought to be closed. If you were out in Moose Jaw, say, in the middle of the area, I think my hon. friend agrees as to what he would do, and I know what I would do. We would not be at the show; and if nobody is

at the show there will not be one, no matter what action they take. I think they will deal with that locally without any difficulty. I think that covers the point.

**Mr. Harkness:** Has the minister looked into it or had determined the constitutionality of the action of some of the provinces in putting an embargo on all livestock and dressed meats from the three prairie provinces, and can he make any statement in regard to that phase of the situation?

**Mr. Gardiner:** Yes, the government has looked into it, and we have had opinions. Unfortunately it is quite difficult to get a definite opinion on a general statement of the position. The general position is that in connection with agriculture and immigration, as is known in this house, both authorities have the right to legislate. But the general interpretation is that, where both have legislated, our legislation overrides the provincial legislation. Both have legislated with regard to this matter in some provinces. When we say ours overrides the other, we have followed in the past the practice of taking under consideration the circumstances surrounding the matter before we would interfere with what the province does. A province may do something which applies only to itself, and which affects only itself and does not affect people elsewhere. We have been inclined not to criticize them for that, or take any action which would void what they are doing. In this case all I would say is that we have given every possible consideration to it. We think we have a way of dealing with it which will be effective and at the same time will not interfere with reasonable actions taken by provinces. I hope that we shall be in a position to make some announcement about that.

**Mr. Harkness:** So far as the powers of embargo of the provinces are concerned, is there any distinction between livestock and dressed meats?

**Mr. Gardiner:** I should not like to give a legal opinion on that, but there is a distinction between the ways in which we have dealt with it up to date. A suggestion has gone out that Ontario asked us to do certain things and we did certain things. Well, Ontario did ask us to do certain things, but all we have done was done before that request was made. What we had done was to agree to people delivering livestock into the stockyards of Winnipeg and into the packing plants of Winnipeg, but we did not agree to any livestock being shipped out of those yards. That simply means in effect that the animal must be killed and turned into beef. But we did not prevent the shipment of beef out of the