

mitted by animals to persons, and respecting the protection of animals. That motion is in order.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-66 be amended in Clause 64 by striking out line 3 at page 29 and substituting the following therefor:

“(i) requiring animals to be treated in such a manner as to avoid or minimize the infliction of pain, suffering or injury on or to animals”.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite brief. During the course of the committee hearings on this piece of legislation we heard from quite a broad range of people who are involved in the animal industry in this country as producers, consumers, handlers and processors.

One of the suggestions that came from the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies was that while it had no particular criticism of the bill it would feel better if there were a better description of humane treatment of animals. It suggested a definition something like this which we have translated into parliamentary language which would lay the ground work and the rules for all future regulations concerning the treatment of animals.

As you read, Mr. Speaker, it simply states that it would require animals to be treated in such a manner as to avoid or minimize the infliction of pain, suffering or injury on or to animals. I think this permits Parliament to put in place the ground rules for the humane treatment of animals. I presume that we would have no great discussion on this, that it seems to be reasonable and acceptable and therefore could be passed forthwith.

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out two or three items.

The present wording of the legislation covers the governing, care, handling and disposition of animals. These words have been chosen because they are used in the title of the recommended codes of practice for the care and handling of animals.

The department has provided funds for the development and publishing of the codes. The codes have been developed for poultry, swine, ranched mink and foxes, veal calves, dairy cattle, and so on.

Government Orders

The development of the codes is co-ordinated by the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies. Representatives from industry groups such as producers, truckers and slaughter plants all have input into those codes.

Professional organizations such as the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association, the Canadian Society of Animal Science and the American Society of Agricultural Engineers provide the expertise in the development of the codes.

The wording of the paragraph proposed by the member for Mackenzie, while interesting, would appear to limit the section to areas where pain, suffering or injury could be inflicted on animals.

I believe that the current wording gives the clause a broader mandate, without the necessity of proving the possibility of pain, suffering or injury.

In addition, the concept of minimizing pain, suffering or injury could be difficult to interpret and might limit the regulations that could be made under this enabling clause.

I would also like to point out that words such as those proposed by the member can be put in the regulations that are prepared under this act. For instance, the current regulations which are made under the Animal Disease and Protection Act use the words “likely to cause injury or undue suffering” to tell people what standards must be met in transporting animals.

These words are more appropriate because they have been tried and tested in prosecutions under the current act and are therefore understood by the industry and Agriculture Canada inspectors.

By putting such words in the regulations rather than in the act each area can be addressed using appropriate words for the specific concern.

We do not believe that the amendment would help the present legislation and could cause us some problems in some ways.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate in the legislative committee on Bill C-66 we had a number of groups, such as the dairy and hog producers, who outlined to us their code of practice for the maintenance of various livestock groups.