

In fact, they looked upon it as a God send that we should send there and attempt to mitigate the disease. The Bill in one section provides that where the animal was affected with rinderpest, the compensation shall be \$50, and in the very next section we find that in the case of an animal afflicted with pleuro-pneumonia, the compensation shall be \$150. Now, I would like to know the reason for this difference.

Mr. MULOCK. I must refer the hon. gentleman to the Imperial House for the information; but I presume the reason is that rinderpest is a more dangerous and incurable disease than pleuro-pneumonia. At all events, the animal is not considered to have the same commercial value in one case as in the other. In the Imperial Statute a similar distinction is made. It is suggested that probably the chances of recovery from rinderpest are less than from pleuro-pneumonia.

Mr. POPE. There is no disease more destructive or supposed to be more incurable in the United States or England than pleuro-pneumonia, and I am sure my hon. friend will find that he has made a mistake in that.

Mr. MULOCK. It is in the English Statute.

Mr. POPE. It may be, but is an animal that dies with one disease worth more than an animal that dies with another? As a general rule, animals are more valuable in England than they are here, and in fixing the amount of compensation last year I took into consideration the difference between the value of an animal in this country and its value in England, and made the price about equal relatively to that in England; and the reason I objected to this Bill was that last year we consolidated and amended the Act. We put this \$150 for thoroughbred cattle where it was only \$40 or \$50 before, and with respect to the other payments they are exactly the same. My object was to bring it all under one Act, because the penalties were not included in that Act in such a way that they could be easily collected. When I found horses should be put very high, I had them struck out of the Act altogether, excepting those brought into the country, that might be quarantined or where disease broke out among them while quarantined; otherwise horses do not come in at all. I have always had a little doubt, and that is the reason why I have been careful in the working of the Act, whether this Act properly belonged to this or the Local Legislature. There is only one reason why it can be introduced here, and that is because it relates to public health. When I found that Ontario and Manitoba had made provisions for cattle disease in their parts of the country, I hoped, and still hope that all the Provinces would do likewise; because an Act can be worked so much easier by the Provinces, except in the case of the importation of animals. Any law affecting that must be passed by this Legislature, or any law affecting the carrying of animals from one Province to another. I believe the provisions under this Act are quite sufficient to meet the exigencies of the case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the Bill was before the House a year ago, there was a very lengthy debate on the subject, as many of us felt that it did not deal in a fair and proper manner with certain classes of the community. In looking over the Bill before the House, I must say that, so far as subsections *a* and *b* are concerned, I would not mind if they were struck out altogether. As regards the cases affected by these clauses, the Bill of last year is amply sufficient. When an animal is taken with a contagious disease, which, in the end, must prove fatal, that is one of those contingencies which the owners of animals, in common with other classes of the community, are subject to, and it seems to me arbitrary to make the public bear the whole or a large part of the loss. It would be almost as reasonable that the country should be

taxed to pay the loss of the farmer from storms and floods, &c. I have no objections to the Act of 1885, so far as that is concerned. It is provided in that Act that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious diseases, and then it provides compensation, if the owner of the animal was not guilty of any negligence or offence against the provisions of the preceding sections of the Act, to the extent of one-third the value of the animal before it became so affected, but not to exceed \$20. That is amply sufficient, unless it should be a contagious disease that in the end is not death—a disease from which the animal would recover without any great loss. Section 12 further provides that the Governor in Council may order the slaughter of any animal that has been in contact with a diseased animal, and not only in contact but in close proximity thereto, or that is suspected of having been in proximity to any animal affected by contagious disease. That is an intolerable hardship. Take the case where one man has a spite against another, and we know very often strong feeling exists between men known as cattle-breeders. If one choose to say: "I know that animal has been in proximity to a suspected animal," he can take steps to have it slaughtered. Again, it is provided that in every other case the compensation shall be two-thirds the value of the animal, but shall not in any case for grade cattle exceed \$40, and that as regards highly bred cattle it shall be two-thirds of the value, but not to exceed \$150. There is where the hardship comes in. We know that the cattle raising industry of the country is large and is every year growing; we know that the animals exported from this country to Great Britain bring an enormous revenue to the country, and everything that can be done reasonably should be done to foster that industry. I need not tell hon. gentlemen acquainted with the subject that it has been found by experience that the only way in which you can keep up the standard of these animals for exportation, is by using first class thoroughbred male sires. It seems also that to keep up the breed frequent importations are necessary. I think, if you allow the Bill to go before the committee, and amend it, there is no need for throwing it out. Sub-section *c* should be retained.

"In every other case the compensation shall be the value of the animal immediately before it is slaughtered, but so that the compensation shall not, in any case, exceed two hundred dollars, except in the case of thoroughbred pedigree animals, in which case it shall not exceed three hundred dollars."

I think that is reasonable. We have many men in the west who have gone into the business of raising thoroughbred stock, and it is too bad that, because a man may suspect that an animal has been in proximity to a diseased animal, that animal should be slaughtered without adequate compensation, and the sum of \$300 is not at all an excessive compensation.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Whatever may be the individual view of members of the House respecting the amount of compensation to be awarded to parties whose stock may be troubled with these infectious diseases, I think it is patent on the face of that, whether this is a matter that belongs to health regulations or not, and whether it should be relegated to the Provinces or not, when we look at the shipping trade of the Dominion, it will strike every member as being one of those questions respecting which it is exceedingly desirable that the Dominion Government should have some regulations. The farmers of Ontario, and in the near future the farmers of our great western prairies, will be very largely interested in the regulations affecting the shipping of cattle at the various points along the seaboard which are in other Provinces and entirely beyond the reach of those Provinces where the greatest values are invested in stock. I think there would be danger if this matter were relegated to the Provinces, that, where the stock business was not