

Foot-and-mouth disease

situation better than they would if any maximum sum is written into this legislation, because you could not put in actual sums.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not maximum sums. The principle should be established that you are either going to pay the farmers the commercial value or that you are going to pay them the economic value. Surely a general principle should be established.

Mr. Gardiner: If we had not been going to pay them more, we would not have needed the legislation at all. In the act as it is now we have the authority to pay the commercial value.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You have not authority to pay for animals that are merely in contact with diseased animals. That is the difference.

Mr. Gardiner: We have authority to pay for animals that we order to be slaughtered.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes.

Mr. Gardiner: We have power to pay the commercial value of animals that we order to be slaughtered. If that is all we were going to do, we did not need this legislation. We need this legislation only because we are going to pay more, and for no other reason. That is the only principle involved. Let us put it through and get the payments made.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We have done that before and afterwards found out that things were not as we thought they were going to be. What I am trying to get at is this. Why not have in that bill simply a provision that the valuation shall equal the economic value?

Mr. Abbott: What is that?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That would be simple. It would not leave to the minister freedom to determine the question. It could then be determined by principle.

Mr. Gardiner: The act now says "fair and reasonable value", which could be even higher than the commercial value, or lower as the case may be.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes; or lower as the case may be.

Mr. Gardiner: Let us go back to my cow with the calf inside her. At the present time those cows are worth at least \$500 each, or many of them are, and the question as to how much the calf is worth depends upon the sire to which the cow has been bred.

Mr. Rowe: Not entirely.

Mr. Gardiner: To a large extent. Those are facts which would have to be considered by those who were considering what was the fair and reasonable value. All that is pro-

vided for in the bill. I do not know how you could make the terms any wider than "fair and reasonable". If you try to put in limiting terms, you will only limit the amount downwards and not in any other direction.

Mr. Blackmore: Mr. Chairman, the members of this group share with other hon. members of the house on all sides the great anxiety which is felt concerning this serious outbreak. We do not wish to prolong the discussion. I do not wish to try to describe exactly what method shall be used to find out what we want. We desire, however, that every possible measure shall be taken by the government, first of all to discover the source of the infection; second, to determine the responsibility for the apparent negligence; third, to provide for the extermination of the disease; and fourth, to protect our livestock industry from impairment. I believe that every one of those requirements has been referred to by hon. members who have spoken thus far. We shall be concerned in seeing how it all works out.

Mr. Argue: I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement just now made by the Minister of Agriculture. When the minister poses the question, why should we say anything about the precise amounts that should be paid to livestock owners, and when he says that it would not be advisable to set a maximum value on the stock affected, all I would say in answer is that we on this side of the house know the Minister of Agriculture well. We know that he always likes to come into parliament and ask for bills that give him certain powers that he usually never uses; but if he uses them, he does not do so in such a way as to provide proper floor prices, proper compensation or anything else for the agricultural industry.

In the statements he has made the minister has certainly made it abundantly clear to everyone in the house and in Canada that his department fell down badly on the job of detecting this disease. The minister says: When I was in Regina on February 14, no one came to me and said this outbreak may be foot-and-mouth disease. If the officials of his department were on their toes, inasmuch as they had been notified of an outbreak on December 2 or 3, they could have told him not on February 14 but many weeks prior to that date that this was in fact foot-and-mouth disease. That is when steps should have been taken to correct it.

What I should like to know, for example, is what the Department of Citizenship and Immigration does in order to see that immigrants coming into Canada from areas where