

of such importance as in those Provinces to which I refer, but through which the stock finds its way to the ocean, the duty might be neglected of keeping a clear access to the British stock market without the embargoes which have been placed on other countries. For that reason, if for no other, I think it is extremely desirable that legislation of this class should exist on the Dominion Statute-book. If it were considered desirable that the Provinces should take the administration of this matter in their own hands, there should at least be a general supervision on the part of the Minister of Agriculture, to see that these provisions are not neglected at points through which our stock reaches the ocean in order to connect with Great Britain. I think the Minister of Railways said that, under the operation of this Act, the farmers of Ontario had not been called upon to pay anything. That is a fact upon which the Ontario farmers may congratulate themselves, but we are not absolutely free from the risk of these contagious diseases among farm stock, and it will be in the recollection of very many of the western members that last fall we had a very severe attack of hog cholera in two or three townships of the county of Essex, which in some places decimated the hog stock of the farmers to a serious extent. I do not know whether the aid of the Dominion Government was invoked in this matter, but I know, as far as the Provincial Government was concerned, that an expert was sent out to those municipalities to look into the difficulty, and as far as possible restrict it. On that occasion, there was a heavy loss to the farmers throughout those townships, and what was their difficulty last season may before very long apply generally to other farmers in the matter of cattle and other stock. I think it is desirable that our regulations should not in any way be relaxed in reference to the protection of the general farmer from the spread of these diseases. I cannot quite agree with the opinion of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he says that the farmer is not entitled to be paid an appreciable proportion of the value, where an animal is diseased and suffers. I would remind hon. gentlemen that, if you place the compensation too low, there is a tendency on the part of the farmer who may be first visited with the disease to conceal the difficulty, and his neighbors may suffer before they are aware that there is such a disease in the neighborhood. Where hog cholera and pleuro-pneumonia and similar diseases break out, the passage of the animals along the public highway may leave such traces of the disease behind them, that other healthy stock, perhaps drinking from the same water or travelling over the same road, may take the disease, and those innocent farmers in the vicinity are thus led into difficulty and loss through the carelessness of perhaps one farmer who does not appreciate the difficulty he is causing to his neighbors. Farmers in that respect are no better than the rest of the community. There are found among them, I am sorry to say, men who are intensely selfish as far as the public interest is concerned. Though I have no desire to see the compensation fixed so high as to make it an inducement for a man to apply for compensation for the loss of his stock, because I believe a farmer ought to run risks such as merchants and others take in their business, yet when you take into account the danger of spreading the disease in that neighborhood, I think the compensation should not be placed at too low a figure. While we have not had the difficulty in Ontario yet, and while I hope it will be far in the future, and indeed that we may never have to apply to the Dominion Treasury for any compensation for the loss of cattle from contagious diseases, yet it must not be forgotten that there is a fair medium in this as in other things, and, when we are placing a Statute on the Statute-book, it is desirable to get it as just and equitable as possible. I am

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth.)

therefore disposed to support some modifications of the Bill of last Session, especially when they are guarded as they are here by leaving a large discretionary power with the Governor in Council or the Minister of Agriculture, if that is thought more desirable, to refuse compensation where it is clearly traceable to a man's own negligence in this matter. I think it is wise for the House to consider whether the compensation may not be fairly somewhat increased.

Mr. THOMPSON. After consultation with the introducer of the Bill, and finding that he has consented to some modifications of it, I have no objection to the second reading.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the House should understand whether the Government are going over to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), or the member for North York is going over to the Government, for we have had two occasions on which these two gentlemen have arrived at this sort of agreement.

Mr. BLAKE. A little of both.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. the mover of the Bill will explain in committee what the amendments are.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, or some other legal gentleman, to point out whether the Act, as it stands, is lame in the particular that I have mentioned. If so, it seems to me that it will not be remedied here. I would like to have that point understood.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me that the Act, as it stands, gives ample power to the Governor in Council to provide for the inspection of cattle, and to cover cases like the one the hon. gentleman mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to amend section 1 by making it read as follows:—

Section 13 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, passed in the Session held in the 48th and 49th years of Her Majesty's reign, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

The Governor in Council may order a compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered under the provision of this Act; and whenever the animal slaughtered was affected by infectious or contagious diseases, the compensation shall be one-third of the value of the animal before it became so affected, but shall not in any such case exceed twenty dollars; in every other case the compensation shall be three-fourths of the value of the animal, but shall not in any case of grade animals exceed fifty dollars; and in any case of thoroughbred pedigree animals two-thirds of the value of the animal, not to exceed one hundred and fifty dollars; and in all such cases the value of the animal shall be determined by the Minister of Agriculture or by some person appointed by him: Provided always, that such compensation may be withheld, in whole or in part, where the owner or the person having charge of the animal has, in the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture, been guilty, in relation of the animal, of an offence against this Act, or where the animal, being a foreign one, was, in his judgment, diseased at the time of entering Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the event of the animal slaughtered having been infected with a contagious disease that was probably curable, would the owner then only be entitled to \$20 if it was slaughtered in order to prevent the spread of the disease, and done at the outbreak of the epidemic? I think that is not right.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not likely the officer would slaughter an animal unless the disease was incurable, in which case, perhaps, \$20 might be all, or more than, it was worth.

Mr. McNEILL. In case of an animal slaughtered because it has, for instance, the mange, the owner ought to receive more compensation than the owner of an animal that is slaughtered because it is infected with rinderpest, which is incurable. I think the Act which was introduced a few minutes ago was very rightly framed in that respect, drawing a distinction between different kinds of infectious