

*Pesticide Residue Contamination*

under the terms of the bill it would be possible to appeal directly to the minister. But, Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of experience in this regard and we know how ineffective such an appeal can be when directed to a minister. We know how much time can elapse before such an appeal reaches a minister's desk. We know there is also a further delay between the time the appeal reaches his desk and the time he is in a position to make a decision. So, although the intentions of the bill may be good, and I feel they are, and although we on this side are prepared to allow the bill to pass, we still have grave reservations about how it will apply to the industries we are concerned about.

[Translation]

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, before this bill is passed, I would like to add a few words to complete the comments I made at the sitting of the committee.

First, I must say that we certainly are in favour of the bill, although it is not perfect for it is difficult to demand absolute perfection.

Mr. Speaker, we are afraid that we are a little confused insofar as compensations are concerned. As a matter of fact, the minister has implied that, as provided for in the law, there is nothing definite in the bill. Under the former bills, which provided for the payment of a fixed amount for the loss of each animal, if the flesh was still fit for consumption, or if the animal no longer had any commercial value, it was still possible to get some compensation. But in the present case, nothing is fixed. It will all depend upon the regulations which the minister or his officials will draw up in favour of the farmers.

Two groups are concerned in the present case: the manufacturers and the farmers who use those pesticides.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told what amounts the minister intends to allow as compensation for the losses suffered by farmers. They represent an increase which in my view should be more liberal. I am glad that a compensation of \$200 for a pure-bred milch-cow and \$129 for a cross-bred cow.

However, there is a point which concerns me constantly and on which I drew the minister's attention in committee. It is the difference between cross-bred milch-cows and pure-bred cows.

In my district, we have cross-bred dairy herds—

[Mr. Danforth.]

[English]

**Mr. Olson:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, while I do not wish to interfere with the hon. member's right to carry on the kind of discussion he has carried on with respect to compensation paid for loss of animals, I think he will agree with me that his remarks apply specifically to Bill C-156 and not to C-155.

[Translation]

**Mr. Speaker:** These last minutes, I had some doubt as to the relevance of the remarks of the hon. member for Roberval, and I was trying to find in the bill the clauses on compensation for loss of animals.

I believe that the point raised by the Minister of Agriculture is well taken and that the present remarks of the hon. member for Roberval rather relate to Bill C-157 entitled "An act to regulate products used for the control of pests and the organic functions of plants and animals".

In my opinion, Bill C-155 now before the house deals more specifically with agricultural products contaminated by pesticides and I do not think, therefore, that the hon. member's comments really referred to the bill under consideration.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Thank you for those remarks, Mr. Speaker. Even if this bill is related to agricultural products damaged by pesticides, I thought that herds could also be affected and that the bill concerned cattle also. So, I will keep my remarks until we debate the bill on animal contagious diseases.

As for Bill C-155 in respect of crops and farmers' property, our only complaint is that the department will be the only decision-making agency on the amount of compensation. That is why I brought the matter to the attention of the committee and I bring it again to the minister's attention. In fact, I realize that since the beginning of this session every time such a subject is brought forward it is referred to the department which will later assess the amount of indemnity.

It is hoped that the regulations that the Minister of Agriculture—who is conversant with the subject—as well as his officers intend to present to us will benefit the farmers. Since an act must be promulgated in respect of the future what will happen with regard to further changes? The minister is not infallible, nor is he eternal. Should a less qualified Minister of Agriculture replace him and should the present officers who are very competent and trustworthy be replaced by