

States. I think those who are familiar with the agricultural situation and the work done in this country, and who compare it with that done by the Department of Agriculture in the United States, will acknowledge that we have accomplished in Canada more effective results at a very much less cost, proportionately. But my hon. friend's request is not unreasonable. I confess, however, that I have not gone into that question in the way he has suggested since discussing this matter on a previous occasion. Roughly speaking, I expect that there will be somewhere about forty establishments, possibly forty-five, where we would have to keep an inspector practically all the time. Paying them on the scale of other inspectors, we would have to give them about \$1,200 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. For the twelve months in the year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I say forty-five establishments; I do not think there are forty-five establishments where they will be needed all the time. While the greater number would need an inspector the whole year, there might be a few others perhaps which would require not one for the whole year.

Mr. FOSTER. The grade of inspectors would be the same?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. Forty-five inspectors at \$1,200 a year, would amount to \$54,000. In addition to that, we anticipate the need of a certain general inspection. There are other establishments which would come under the operation of the Act where an inspector would not be needed all the time, possibly four or five, but not so many as ten. Over these inspectors there would be a sort of chief inspector, with a higher salary. I should expect that altogether these additional inspectors would cost about \$10,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. These will be appointed for the whole year?

Mr. FISHER. Probably most of them, but not all of them necessarily.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the chief inspector be over these and the permanent ones as well?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the salary of your chief?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend a little upon what I may be able to get him for. The chief inspector would have to be rather an exceptional man and it is quite possible that I may have to pay him as much as \$2,000 a year. I would like to get a man cheaper but I want to get a man who is thoroughly experienced. It may be that we will have to get a man from abroad who is thoroughly experienced in this system of meat inspection and who is able to

Mr. FISHER.

instruct the other inspectors. It is rather difficult offhand to state at what salary we can get such a man. I think it would be worth while to pay a few hundred dollars a year more to get a thoroughly competent and experienced man to give that instruction to the other inspectors which they would require rather than to adopt a cheese paring policy in the matter. This work is practically altogether new in this country, and at the present time I do not know that there is anybody in the country who has had the experience necessary to instruct a body of men such as that which would be required to act as inspectors. But, if there is such a man in this country I shall certainly prefer to employ him than to bring anybody from abroad. That would account for about \$65,000 of the expenditure and I think that \$10,000 for incidentals ought to be sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking in travelling expenses and all?

Mr. FISHER. The permanent stationary inspectors would not have any travelling expenses and it would be the general inspectors who would have. It might be that in some cases a salary of \$1,200 would not be required but that some of these men could be got for \$1,000. I took that as the limit. I did not think that I would have to give more than \$1,200 for the ordinary inspectors. I may be able to get some of them for \$1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be staff expenses in Ottawa. You will have to have some tabulation and the like of that done here.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there will be a clerk or two and perhaps a stenographer in addition to the staff itself. The general superintendence of the matter will be in the hands of the live stock and veterinary commissioner who would do this work along with the other work of his office, but, of course he would have to have a chief inspector who would be superior to these other men. That is my idea of the organization and working out of the system. I do not know that I can go very much further into detail than that. I consider that in work of this kind one cannot foresee all the details that may arise and which require to be met, but this has been the calculation which we have made.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a satisfactory statement as far as it goes of the details as to what the minister proposes to do about the grading of the staff, the salaries, &c. The only point that remains is this: What information has he that the whole number of establishments that are to be inspected permanently in the Dominion of Canada will not go more than forty or forty-five? I thought from the discussions in this House that there would be more meat