

Mr. SPROULE. There are many other diseases to which cattle are liable. I believe when animals are killed they are killed for the safety of the community, and in no case should the allowance be made specific in this Bill, notwithstanding the fact that we are following a precedent established in the Mother Country. If an animal is affected it cannot be worth its original value, because even if it should be likely to recover, there are uncertainties about that matter, and there is danger not only in regard to the spreading of the disease but in regard to the death of the animal itself. It is, therefore, unreasonable either to ask or expect that the value of the animals should be paid in the event in question. If the Bill is allowed to pass it should be very much amended and a great reduction in compensation made, because we have not so many valuable animals here as in England. Therefore the argument does not apply with such force as it does in England. Another reason why it is much more important for us to see that diseased cattle are slaughtered, is from the cattle trade we have with the Mother Country. It is the more necessary because England can schedule our cattle, whereas the same principle would not apply in England. Again, in regard to the price of cattle, the price being lower in this country, the average price paid should likewise be lower. For the general good of the community a reasonable sum should be paid, but no more than half the value of the animal, and in special cases where the animals are held at high figures some specific sum should be settled, much lower than what is proposed, which the Department should be compelled to pay.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The interest affected by this Bill is so very large that it becomes a matter of vast interest to all those who represent agricultural constituencies. We have in this country a very large and flourishing interest, a very large number of cattle, sheep and pigs, and since farming has not been paying as well of late years as it formerly did the attention of the farming community has been directed to the improvement of stock and to increasing the number of the animals raised. The idea contained in this Bill is that the public interest is paramount, that when it becomes necessary in the public interest to slaughter cattle to prevent the spread of a contagious disease, compensation should be awarded. We see this principle carried out in various ways. When it became necessary in the public interest to construct railways the right of way is purchased and fair compensation is awarded to the owners of the line through which the road will run. That is the principle which is obvious and admitted. When animals are affected by disease their recovery is not always doubtful, they may recover and be of their full value. But I do not see why only one-third of the value of those animals should be paid by the country. If it is in the public interest that the disease should be stamped out and animals be slaughtered which might probably recover, then there should be full compensation. The Bill of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) provides that the compensation shall be larger. It is but an extension of the principle admitted in the construction of railways, where the people who sell their land to the railway company are entitled to its full value. When we have admitted that principle I do not see how you can apply an opposite principle to the farming community. It is not fair, when a farmer is obliged to slaughter an animal affected with the diseases mentioned in the Bill, that only one-third of the value of such animal should be paid, and that it should not exceed \$20. There are many farmers who have cattle worth \$50 or \$60. If they become affected by any disease mentioned in the Bill they will have to be slaughtered under its provisions, and yet they would only receive \$20, and this slaughtering has been done in the public interest. In the other cases two-thirds of the value will be

allowed, but in no case shall it exceed \$40. The present Bill proposes its extension to the neighborhood of \$150. There are many of our farmers who have thoroughbred cattle which they have imported for the purpose of improving the breed, and which had been purchased at very high prices, and if they became affected with pleuropneumonia, and it became necessary, in the public interest, that they should be slaughtered, it would be pretty hard towards any of those farmers to inform him that the amount of compensation obtainable was \$40. Why should the public be asked to pay less than the value of the animal, if it is slaughtered in the general interest? Why should they be asked to pay less than any individual would be obliged to pay in a like case? The probabilities are that if the animal is diseased it will recover, and the only reason why it is slaughtered, is for the purpose of preventing the extension of the disease. Now, this Bill is evidently a step in the right direction, and conceiving it to be such, I heartily support it. I believe it is but doing justice to the farming community of this country, who are largely interested in stock raising, that they should receive a fairer compensation in such cases than they have under the present law. I think the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), is deserving of the thanks of the farming community in this country, and the thanks of this House, for having brought the matter so prominently before the House, and I hope the Bill will receive favorable consideration at the hands of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are two points in which it seems to me this Bill differs from the law as it stands. One is certainly a most important matter and well deserving of the consideration of the House. As the law stands if any person has the misfortune to have his cattle slaughtered under the provisions of the law, and if at any time he has been an offender against the provisions of the Act, although not in reference to the particular animal slaughtered, he is not entitled to compensation. I certainly quite agree with the principle of this Bill, which applies that restriction to their right to get compensation to the particular transaction in which it arises. The other matter in which I think this proposed measure is an improvement upon the existing law, is this: Where the animal is diseased and on account of that the animal is slaughtered, it is proper to say, I think, that the owners should not get full compensation. But if the animal is not diseased, and if the animal is slaughtered merely by reason of the other provisions of the Act, which entitles the Government to destroy it because it might possibly have been in contact with an animal which is diseased, the destruction of the animal being considered to be in the public interest, the owner should receive compensation. These are two matters in which I think this Bill differs from the existing law. The other matters are matters of detail which can be dealt with, as I understand the mover asks they should be dealt with, in committee. I have much pleasure in saying that I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I do not profess to have any practical knowledge of the subject with which the Bill professes to deal, but I think it is worthy the attention of the House to consider, at this stage, whether a change like this should be made in such an Act, involving very considerable additions to the expenditure in carrying out the law, if the Act is to receive any extensive operation at all. I understand that up to the present time, with the exception of some cattle which were killed in the Province of Nova Scotia, no case has occurred in which the Act has had to be put in force. Not a single case has occurred of an animal having been slaughtered under its provisions, and, therefore, I think it is somewhat premature to undertake to amend the provisions of the Act. If, however, the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, being, of course,