

Mr. DONNELLY: Have any new restricted areas been established?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No, not for this year.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): There has been no extension of restricted areas?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No; there are no new restricted areas.

Mr. GERSHAW: In case of epidemic among horses or cattle what do the officers of the department do in the way of investigation and the recommendation of treatment?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In the case of an infectious disease, if the farmer or the owner of the stock will get in touch with the district inspector for the province he will be given full advice and the matter will be investigated by the federal officials.

Mr. GIROUARD (Translation): Could the hon. Minister inform the House whether the tuberculin test of cattle comes under item No. 56?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes.

Mr. GIROUARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in 1929, the Department of Agriculture undertook the tuberculin test of cattle in the county of Drummond. The officers of the department were carrying out this test in the parishes of South Durham and "L'Avenir", when, in the autumn of 1930, they were recalled, we understand, so as to be sent to another county. Since that date, I wrote on various occasions to the Department of Agriculture, at Ottawa; nevertheless, the work begun, in 1929, was continuously postponed. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will understand that it is most important to the farmers of these parishes that the test which was begun should be continued without interruption. I wish to specially refer, in this connection, to the parish of "L'Avenir" in the county of Drummond. I would request the hon. Minister of Agriculture to kindly give orders that the tuberculin test begun in 1929 and 1930, be resumed.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): My information is that no work has yet been done in Drummond county. However I shall be happy to look into the matter raised by the hon. member and write him personally in connection therewith.

Mr. DUPUIS: What amount of indemnity is paid for each head to be destroyed?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): For grades the maximum is \$40 and for pure breds \$100.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the resolution carry?

[Mr. R. Weir.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. When this vote was under consideration a few days ago there was considerable discussion about the proposed merging of the live stock branch with the health of animals branch. The minister's explanation left upon the minds of some hon. members the impression there was nothing in the rumor, while on the minds of the rest of us it left the impression that there was something in it. I should like him to elucidate a little more and let us know his position. If he does not mean to merge the two branches he has done himself a great injustice by not being more explicit, and if he does mean to merge them nothing could be gained by concealing the fact.

While I am on my feet I should like to point out that these two branches were at one time under the control of the late Doctor Rutherford, a very prominent veterinarian, at one time chief veterinary inspector and later veterinary director general. I remember quite well that although the two branches were merged under him he came to the conclusion that they should not be merged. However, he was head of both branches, and his position made it possible for him to be fairly just to both. The positions he had occupied enabled him to pay particular attention to the health of animals end of his new duties. He expressed the opinion that they should be separated, with the result that his successor, the late Doctor Torrance, in the year 1912 or 1913 did carry out the separation. The late John Bright then became live stock commissioner, and the two branches have been working smoothly ever since. I take the ground that after twenty years of separation the minister should have some valid reason for suggesting a merger.

When the matter was under discussion before I gave some reasons why they should not be merged. Will the minister tell us whether he is or is not going to merge these branches, so that the discussion may be terminated. If it is his intention to merge them all I can do is to admonish him that in the light of past history, and in view of the splendid work the branches have been doing he should not merge them, because in fact they are quite separate and distinct in their character and viewpoint.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): If hon. members who were in attendance at the last meeting of the committee had read what I said on that occasion I do not believe there would be any doubts remaining in their minds. If, after full consideration—

Mr. BROWN: "If" after.