

Animal Contagious Diseases

ing on with the present methods and continuing vaccination. This will not eliminate the infection, as I have said, but it will permit us to carry on with a low level of infection. This choice provides that if mass vaccination takes place throughout Canada, it will involve approximately three million calves a year, if we vaccinate all the calves in Canada, at a total cost of \$12 million to \$15 million annually.

● (1240)

The second choice which has been proclaimed—I certainly agree with it—involves the decision that brucellosis should be eradicated. In fact, brucellosis can be eradicated. As I have said, this has been done in other countries—and I mentioned them—and it can certainly be done here. With total eradication, I suggest that now or in the immediate future vaccination will be eliminated. It will take a while to do this, but if owners go along with the idea I think it is the only solution we have. It involves totally eliminating vaccination of calves against brucellosis.

In spite of the present opposition, I think we are making progress. With the co-operation and support of the livestock industry, it is felt certain that eradication can be accomplished. But the livestock industry must want eradication and must not want to live with infection. If we can convince the livestock industry of this fact, I think we will be well on the way to totally eliminating this disease. All of us working together in federal and provincial jurisdictions to fight this disease is the only way we can hope to eliminate it once and for all.

Our party supports the principle of Bill C-28, and except for a few changes that may be advocated at the committee stage, which may hold it up slightly, I see no reason for not passing the bill with the minimum delay.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) who had to be in his constituency yesterday, would be here in time today to speak on our behalf in respect of Bill C-28. Since he has not arrived yet, perhaps I might say a few words to indicate our support of this bill. Indeed, I hope that it will not take long for it to be put into effect.

As the previous speaker, the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) indicated, there may be some details to examine more closely when the bill is before the standing committee, but in general we welcome this legislation. We are sorry it has had to stay on the order paper for a full year before getting to the stage of second reading.

As the previous speaker pointed out, perhaps one of the significant points to note is that the name of the act is being changed, and I suggest it is more than just a change of name. From now on, instead of this legislation being known as the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, it will be known as the Animal Disease and Protection Act. As the minister put it, and as notes in the bill make clear, this is consistent with the fact that provisions are being made in this legislation to deal not only with diseases that may affect animals but also with things that can happen to them in the process of transportation, and so on.

As the minister reminded us, this legislation has been around for a long time, having first been passed in 1869,

[Mr. Mitges.]

and it is understandable that some updating is necessary. One of the ways in which that updating is clear, it seems to me, can be seen when one looks at some of the definitions that have had to be enlarged. For example, we now have a definition of "animals" which, as the minister says, includes a bee. We also have an improved definition of "animal products," "animal by-products," "infectious diseases," "reportable diseases," and so on. It is our view that these are all improvements, technical though they may be, which will make it possible for the department to administer this legislation in the interests of all farmers in this country and also in the interests of the consumers of livestock products.

I note in particular that there is a whole new part of the bill having to do with transportation. This seems both necessary and welcome. We note, also, the parts of the bill having to do with what can happen, or what must not happen to dead animals. This is something that has been of concern. I realize we are not now talking about matters that come under the Department of National Health and Welfare, but we are talking about a related matter. There is some public agitation and concern about this, and it strikes us that the minister's bill will meet these concerns.

Like the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe, I think a further look may need to be taken in the committee at the whole question of compensation for animals that are ordered to be slaughtered under the terms of this legislation. I join with him in saying a few words, particularly about the question of brucellosis. I think the speaker who preceded me, professional that he is in the field, was very much on the beam when he said the time has come to resolve the question as to whether we are going for vaccination or for the eradication of this disease.

As the minister knows, back in in the 1940s a very elaborate campaign of vaccination against brucellosis was launched. I understand at the height of that campaign it reached the point where a million or more animals had been vaccinated against brucellosis. More recently, the government has been de-emphasizing the brucellosis vaccination campaign and emphasizing the greater desirability of eradicating the disease completely. That, of course, means that the slaughtering of animals comes more and more into the picture.

I understand that in most parts of Canada the problem is reasonably well under control. In western Canada, I think it is under control in all provinces but Saskatchewan, and the authorities there are making progress. I understand it is under control in the Atlantic provinces. I am told that the worst problem is right here in Ontario, and perhaps the worst of all right here in the Ottawa Valley. While it is not something to be alarmed about, it is nevertheless a problem that should be conquered.

It seems to me that the criticism is valid when it is said the levels of compensation the government offers for animals that have to be destroyed because of brucellosis are not high enough to encourage the owners of stock to go for the eradication route. If you do not pay these owners enough for the animals that have to be slaughtered, then they are more interested in vaccinating, hoping they can gain by that economically. I suggest that the previous speaker was quite right in saying that the vaccination