

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): There is one step that can be taken other than the municipal testing plan; that is, if the municipalities would insist on receiving milk only from tested herds. I refer to the supervised herd plan. If the municipality passes a by-law insisting that only milk from tested herds will be accepted, any farmer wishing to supply milk can make application to the health of animals branch to have his herd tested under the supervised herd plan. At the present time that service is given free, and at the same time the farmer agrees to keep his herd from contact with other herds in order to prevent the spread of the disease.

Mr. BRADETTE: The minister knows it is absolutely impossible to prevent that contact during the summer months when the herds are in pasture.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In common pasture?

Mr. BRADETTE: We have no common pasture, but I believe the zone should be established because of that very fact. I might have my herd tested; if my neighbour does not have his herd tested there is bound to be contact during the summer months and probably I will sustain a heavy loss in a short period. That is why I believe it should be a general rule. The minister can readily understand that the by-laws of a municipality apply only within that municipality. If some municipality obtains its milk from surrounding townships, as is the case in Cochrane, they may get polluted milk under present conditions. I believe it is within the power of the federal government to create a general zone, at least as far as inspection is concerned, so that the people who have gone to the sacrifice and expense of weeding out their herds may have their stock protected to that extent.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should like to revert to the question raised by the hon. member for Lisgar, the answer to which I did not interpret quite as he did. The minister was very explicit in denying certain alleged statements which appeared in the western press, but he was not so specific in assuring us that after all there was not something in this proposed merger of the live stock and health of animals branches. I felt that I could detect some reservation in his statement.

I was not quite satisfied with the answer given by the minister. We all know that the paper referred to was the Winnipeg Free Press and that the reporter and editor was Miss Cora Hind. These are two quite responsible authorities, especially the latter, on live

[Mr. Bradette.]

stock and field agriculture. I am not so sure that it is enough merely to denounce the rumours and reports which appeared in that newspaper, without some further assurance than the minister has yet given. The minister said that possibly a closer cooperation between those two branches might be encouraged to advantage. At one time they were together, but in practice it was found that while both have to do with live stock they view that question from entirely different angles. From the standpoint of the live stock commissioner live stock has to do with the breed and breeding, the marketing, the conformation and so on, while from the standpoint of the veterinary director general live stock has to do with the health of animals, the wiping out and exclusion of contagious diseases and kindred problems. The veriest scrub animal, so long as it has horns, hoofs and tail, can carry disease just as easily as a good animal, and so I think these two branches are sufficiently dissimilar to be kept quite distinctively apart.

Perhaps I am a little suspicious in this matter; I have no occasion to feel that way as yet, because the minister has left the department pretty much as he found it. I have great respect for those who preceded me in the department, particularly the late Doctor Rutherford, who was regarded by all as an authority on live stock and who was a prominent veterinarian both nationally and internationally. But it does not follow that some of us may not be able to improve even on his administration. First, however, I want to understand just what is to be done by way of suggested improvement before I agree that there will be any improvement on Doctor Rutherford's work, and I have not seen that yet. Doctor Rutherford took the ground that these two branches should be kept apart. There is even a certain amount of friction between them, not of an unfriendly character, but for the very reason, as already intimated, that their points of view are entirely different. I have known them to take absolutely different views on a given case though they were not at all unfriendly to each other.

If the question of animal health or disease should be determined finally by the live stock commissioner, how would such a certificate be looked upon in other countries or even by live stock men of our own? The live stock commissioner is not a veterinary practitioner and does not pretend to be, although a good live stock man. He may be a first class man in other respects, but if he is to be the predominant figure in these two branches I say that we shall lose the standing which the