

with the question of live stock. It was stated, for instance, in one of the reports, that it would be a mistake to put the health of animals branch under a layman. As a matter of fact it has been under one layman or two laymen for quite a number of years. It is under the deputy minister, who is a layman, and it is also under the Minister of Agriculture. Surely no one would object if it were decided to put it under the live stock commissioner; it would not lose anything in that connection, especially if it retained the same specialists as it has at present in charge of it. A good deal of thought has been given by the heads of both branches as to how they could amalgamate some of the services, for instance, in the city of Moose Jaw, the hog graders and the stockyard agents who are under the live stock branch and the stock car inspectors and some other officials who are under the health of animals branch. But I can assure hon. gentlemen that no one in the house is more anxious than I am, for the sake of the live stock industry, to retain to the full the efficiency of the health of animals branch and in any way that we can to increase that efficiency. Practically my whole stake in agriculture is in live stock, and perhaps it is because of the work I have been carrying on in that connection, the consideration and investigation of the whole problem, that some of these unwarranted rumours have arisen by people being overanxious to criticize, regardless of the false statements they may make through the press, upsetting the public. So far as I am concerned, in connection with the health of animals branch or the live stock branch, nothing will be done that will in any way lower the efficiency of those connected with the live stock industry.

There are, however, problems with which we are confronted. As the health of animals branch extends its scope and therefore is forced to take on additional staff and to undertake work that previously had been done by private practitioners, the tendency is to drive the private practitioners out of business. The most important thing, perhaps as important as the health of animals branch, is that we should retain and encourage in all parts of the dominion where live stock are found, the highly efficient services of private practitioners. That has been the chief line along which our investigation has taken us. We think now we have reached a conclusion as to a method by which some of the work of the health of animals branch can be done by private practitioners as cheaply as, if perhaps not more cheaply than, it is being done at the present time. In this way we shall safeguard the work by having private practitioners, who

[Mr. R. Weir.]

wish to avail themselves of this work and the remuneration in connection with it, pass examinations set by the veterinary director general and his staff. Their work will be carried on, as it is at present, under the veterinary director general. Our veterinary colleges are now being attended by too few men and the brightest young men who attend those colleges are, because they are bright, absorbed by the health of animals branch as soon as they graduate. They might have a great future if they went into private practice, but we hope to make the remuneration better for them. As I say, because they are bright, we take them into the health of animals branch in various capacities, and their work there, although of importance, is to a great extent routine. Therefore they are not developing their abilities and their value to a large degree is lost to the live stock industry of the country. That perhaps is the most important statement I would have to make in regard to some reorganization that may take place.

Second, it is felt that we can combine under a common head some of the work that is being done. For instance, in British Columbia or Saskatchewan or Alberta there is a district inspector who is in charge only of men doing field work, that is veterinaries who are situated at boundary points or are doing work such as tuberculosis testing or other work. Besides that there is under the health of animals branch another group of men such as meat inspectors, stock car inspectors and so on. They are not in any way subject to the man who is in charge of the field men, but have another head. After full discussion we have felt it is only logical that the one man should be sufficiently qualified to look after both branches because in the province of Saskatchewan I believe there are at present eighteen field men, four of whom are boundary point men. So that there are really only fourteen field men left, and to supervise those fourteen there is another man whose work is not to go into the field and do actual field work but to administer the office, with the assistance of a clerk and a stenographer. We think he should do that work well and in addition supervise the other work, which would make the health of animals work in the province just as efficient, and probably more so in that it would be under one head.

It would also make it better for people making inquiries because they would know where to go. Sometimes serious mistakes are made, not particularly in this connection but in the various branches of agriculture, because information has been received from the wrong