

It is now proposed, honourable senators, to repeal subsection 2 and in its place to have this new subsection:

(2) The compensation ordered to be paid under this section for an animal slaughtered under the provisions of this act shall be the market value that the animal, in the opinion of the minister or some person appointed by him, would have had immediately before slaughter if it had not been subject to slaughter under the provisions of this act . . .

In other words, the limits set by the present act are to be removed, and in their place provision is made that the minister or a committee representing him will decide what is the market value of the diseased stock, and that amount will be paid to the owners.

In practice, as honourable senators know, the minister does not do the actual appraising; and he would be unwise to do so. The committee representing him would consist of a veterinarian inspector, and a representative of the Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture, as well as a representative of the department's Livestock Division. Those three men would set the value of any stock that went down with some contagious disease, such as hog cholera or tuberculosis.

Perhaps I could give an illustration which would explain more clearly the effect of the proposed legislation. Under the present act the owner of a pure-bred hog worth, for example, \$100 would be paid at the most \$50. Under the present bill, if it is enacted, the owner of such a hog would receive \$100, provided the committee decided that at a recent sale in that community such a hog brought \$100. If it were a grade hog worth, say, \$50, its owner would receive under the present legislation \$30, but under this bill he would receive what in the opinion of the committee the animal would have actually brought at a recent sale in his community; and if it were of the type which, had it not been diseased, would have been sold for meat, the committee would allow the owner what the slaughter house would have paid him for it.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: What is the limit? Is it more than \$50?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The limit is to be removed.

There are two other paragraphs in this new subsection which have to do with compensation for diseased horses and cattle. In the case of horses, the bill would allow up to \$200 for pure-bred animals and \$100 for grade animals; for cattle, the allowance is to be \$100 for pure-bred and \$40 for grade animals. But under an amendment made to this act back in 1949, which honourable members will recall was made retroactive to some time in 1947, the owner of diseased

cattle is not limited to receiving \$100 or \$40, but he receives what the carcass would have brought if sold for meat.

Hon. Mr. Hayden: There is no change in the law in that regard?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No change in paragraphs (a) and (b), but I would like to point out that there is a difference between diseased swine and sheep and diseased cattle. Diseased carcasses of swine and sheep are usually of very little value, if any, for meat purposes. That is, it is not considered safe to use the carcass of a diseased hog or sheep for human consumption; whereas, in the case of cattle, if an animal goes down with tuberculosis the glands infected with T.B. are removed and the carcass is often used for human consumption. May I illustrate that still further: if you took a pure-bred animal that was worth, say, \$300, under this legislation, which in this respect is not being changed, the owner would receive \$100 and also what the animal would bring if sold for meat. It might bring an additional \$100 or more.

Hon. Mr. Hayden: The valuation allowed for a carcass is made on the basis that it could be lawfully sold at that time at a certain price?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: On the basis, as my honourable friend says, that the sale was lawful.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Does that apply to pure-bred stock as well as grade stock?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That applies to pure-bred stock and grade stock.

Hon. Mr. Howden: Do I understand from what my honourable friend says that animals infected with tuberculosis can be used for human consumption?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Carcasses of diseased cattle are often used for food purposes after the glands or other infected parts have been removed. But, if I may repeat, it is not considered safe to use diseased carcasses of swine or sheep.

Hon. Mr. Howden: The human body is often subject to focal involvement, and I would imagine that these animals are too. I therefore think it is doubtful if these animals would be fit for use.

Hon. Mr. Horner: It might depend on the stage of the disease, on how far the disease had progressed.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As it has worked out, it has been found that if the disease has not developed very far and is contained in certain