COORDINATION OF HEALTH DEPARTMENT AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS

PAUL W. SWISHER, Commissioner
Colorado Department of Agriculture, Denver 2, Colorado

The failure of agriculture production to keep up with our increase in population and foreign commitments can be attributed to several factors, one of which is the interference of government with its many restrictive laws and regulations. The Commissioner urges that regulatory agencies should pre-view their proposed enactments in cooperation with related governmental groups to ascertain whether or not the new measure will advance or hinder production.

In discussing the question of coordination of health department and agriculture department programs, I view the problem primarily from the viewpoint of an administrator of the agricultural department. Having spent the greater part of my life in the first field and only a very short time in the second, I dare say that some of the statements may be biased and probably many of you will disagree with them. My statements are not directed at any department of health or division of that department, or any department of agriculture, but at the general overall problem — particularly not at Colorado's Health Department which has as fine a group of people I have ever worked with. They have been very cooperative.

America is confronted with a major job of food production. Not only to feed our own people but to feed the people of other nations. With all the new soil practices, modern machinery, development of new types of crops and livestock, uses of fertilizers, new insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and many other new agricultural practices, agriculture production is not keeping up with our increase in population. There are many causes for this: To list a few, I might say the passing of the family type farm, the loss of our farm population, the decrease of our soil fertility, and contrary to the conception of the average consumer, the income from farming is not adequate to induce the farm boys and girls to remain on the farm or to induce many city dwellers to move to the farm. Interference from the Federal Government, too many restrictive laws and regulations, and many other things have helped to bring about this situation.

It is the last of these I have mentioned that I would like to discuss with you today.

REGULATORY CONFUSION

Farmers resent regulations because of their native, inherited instincts of independence. However, in the last few years the public have developed new concepts in their expectations of service from state and federal governments. Let up keep in mind that nearly every law passed was requested by some group wishing a regulatory service. Consequently, when we draft a law, or write a regulation, we should consider the following:

(1) Will this be a service to the public? (2) Will it accomplish the intent of the law? (3) Is it fair and reasonable to the group being regulated? (4) What selling points should be used in enforcing the regulations? (5) Is it enforceable? (6) Is it flexible enough to allow the most protection to the public at the least cost and inconvenience to the producer or business man?

(7) Is the regulation so written that it can be readily understood by all concerned?

In writing regulations pertaining to sanitation, involving agriculture products, the health and agriculture departments should work together.

The functions of both the health departments and agriculture departments are primarily in the educational and regulatory fields.

(a) The health department, along with many of their other functions, is concerned with the protection of life and health from contamination, either natural or artificial, of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

(b) The agriculture departments are primarily concerned with the economic problems of agriculture. They administer laws and regulations that, directly or indirectly, will increase production and income through marketing better quality and grades of livestock, livestock products and other farm crops; and also, furnish to the consumer a quality product that is free from contamination. In this field particularly we must go hand in hand with the health departments. Needless to say, any food or food product that is dangerous to health would sooner or later eliminate itself from markets, due to public opinion.

The major problem has been, and is at the present time, centered around each department's jealousy of its prerogatives and its inability to do the job assigned them. Also, due to the fact that both operate in the same agricultural field and with the same agricultural products, there is always a question of interpretation of extent of jurisdiction. Another problem is the interpretation of sanitary regulations. What is sanitary and what is not? Not only is this determination a problem of the departments, but a problem of the individual in the field who makes the inspection.

The lack of cooperation between the health departments and agricultural departments has been very expensive and confusing to producers and processors of many agricultural products. In many cases the departments will have different sanitary rules and regulations, and in some cases, even different laws pertaining to the same commodity. We do not seem to be satisfied with this; we must keep changing these regulations every year or so, necessitating the continuous remodeling of plants so far as the processor is concerned and changing the method of handling the product so far as the producer is concerned.

We are clearly illustrating that we do not know what we want or where we are going, and the people we are supposed to be working for do not know what to expect next. This confusion, indecision and "dickering" is costing the producer and consumer vast sums of money unnecessarily.

The changing methods of production, the concentration of our people, and the methods of handling, of necessity, require sanitary laws and regulations. However, there must be a common-sense approach to these problems. This can be accomplished if the two departments will forget their petty jealousies, their "holier-than-thou" attitude, and strive for a congenial working relationship in their attempt to solve these problems.

This much for the problem that confronts us. Is there a solution to it? I think there is.

In Colorado we are attempting to get the Health Department and Agriculture Department together on the sanitary regulations and the interpretation of these regulations in all fields where we have joint services. Although we are a long way from getting the complete job done, we have made much progress. If those of us in the Agriculture Department continue to get the splendid cooperation from the Health Department we have had since we started to work on this problem, I am sure we will soon have the greater part of our differences solved.

**Suggested Procedures**

I would like to recommend to you a few procedures that, if followed, will go a long way toward solving the differences between the departments, and render the people of industry the services to which they are entitled, and at the same time give the consumer adequate protection. The first thing a department must recognize is that the other department is not like the "Long-horned Texas Steer—a horn here and a horn there and a lot of Bull in between". There must be an effort on the part of each department to understand the problems of the other, and recognize there is a difference in view point.

Regulations pertaining to sanitary standards of agriculture products should be written jointly. This is fundamental and very necessary. The departments may look at the problem in a different way. Further, it will tend toward more uniform interpretation of the regulations. Many of the conflicting ideas can be ironed out as the regulations are written, and regulations so written are more workable.

If the regulations are jointly written, then the licensing or administrative department must keep the other informed at all times, as to the administrative procedures; also the problems confronted in the administration. It is very necessary that representatives of the departments hold, occasionally, joint meetings to discuss the administration of any joint regulation, in order to make adjustments if necessary.

In the drafting of new legislation, if the legislation, in any way, might involve the other department, directly or indirectly, then each should work on the legislation and support it together, thus eliminating the common occurrence of one fighting the legislation of the other department, which is the cause of much ill feeling between departments in the past. We should have more of the Quaker attitude. If he gets hit on one cheek, he turns the other, then 2 yrs. "I have complied with the scriptures, now I will knock the tar out of them." If there must be disagreement, keep it in the departments until worked out. Never in public.

At all times there must be an effort made in each department to eliminate the custom of criticizing members of the other departments, particularly to the public. Back passing is amateur and should not be tolerated. If you cannot say something good about the other department, then keep your mouth shut.

Much of our difficulties stem from our inspection service. To a large extent this is due to the human element that enters into the picture. The different interpretations that may be given to the regulations. Consequently, it is very necessary that adequate supervision be made of inspections by each department. If a regulation of the health department is to be administered by the agriculture department, then from time to time the health department must make joint inspections. What might suit the agriculture department might not be acceptable to the health department. In this way the program can be administered as it is intended.
and will eliminate the "buck-passing" that usually exists.

Let's keep in mind that our duty is to serve and protect the citizens of the state and that to the average citizen a supervisor of the health department or a supervisor of the agriculture department is a representative of the state government. The public cannot understand or have patience with conflicting ideas or standards which the two departments may have.

Information that is released to the press has caused much unnecessary loss to agriculture in this state as well as others. I do not criticize the press for printing it, but there must be a closer working relationship between the departments in editing the news release. A news story that went out a few years ago, in regard to irrigation water used for irrigation of vegetables, along the south Platte River, almost put this state out of the vegetable-producing business. We dropped 1600 cars in one year. A news release last winter, in regard to turkeys, cost the turkey producers of this state a quarter of a million dollars. I could mention many more which, like these two cases, were later proven to be without adequate substantiating evidence to prove the news stories correct. These releases, however, were not made by the Colorado Health Department. I do not mean to insinuate that these stories should not be released, if true, but let's make sure they are before being released, as they are very expensive. This is becoming a greater problem each year as we develop new insecticides, fungicides, and other chemicals that are used in the production of agricultural products. Fact is, we are all becoming about as confused over this whole problem as the little boy that dropped his bubble gum in the chicken pen.

In most of the states we find in many of our large cities city health units which may have regulations pertaining to agricultural commodities. In cities where there is such a health unit it is advisable that not only the agriculture department but also the city health unit work together in writing up regulations which pertain to commodities regulated by the other division.

Such is the case of Colorado. The City of Denver has a very good health unit which has cooperated with us one hundred percent in working out joint inspections and regulations pertaining to agricultural products.

Agriculture and agricultural products either raw or processed have always been and will always remain one of the basic segments of the entire economic system. For the welfare of our nation we must have both commercial and sanitary regulations of our food products. Therefore, let both the health and agricultural departments work shoulder to shoulder, cooperately, toward building and carrying out these necessary regulations in such a manner that our nation or any segment thereof will benefit to the highest degree.

ARIZONA DAIRY TECHNOLOGY SOCIETY

Recently an Arizona Dairy Technology Society was organized. The officers elected for 1952 are: President, George Miller, Borden Co., Phoenix; Vice-President, Jim Ruth-eford, Arden Farms, Phoenix; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. J. Warren Stull, Dairy Husbandry Department, University of Arizona, Tucson; Recording Secretary, Henry Ware, Department of Public Health, Phoenix; and Sergeant-at-Arms, Harry Porterfield, Carnation Co., Phoenix.

At the regular monthly meeting held on May 5 in Phoenix, the guest speaker was Dr. P. H. Tracy, Professor of Dairy Technology, University of Illinois. Dr. Tracy's talk on "Some Recent Developments in Dairy Technology Research" was attended by about 100 members and guests.

Pennsylvania Short Courses in Dairy Manufacturing

1. Testing Milk, Cream, and Dairy Products
   January 5 to 10, 1953

   This course is designed for those who wish to become more proficient in testing dairy products, and for those who wish to take an examination for a license in weighing, sampling, and testing.

2. Ice Cream Course for Dairy Equipment and Supply Men
   December 8 to 13, 1952

   One-week training in the manufacture of ice cream for dairy equipment and supply men, exclusively, will be given. Topics handled in the one-week course will include, mainly, composition of ice cream, ingredients used, standardization of acidity, calculation, processing, flavoring, freezing, overrun, and hardening of ice cream, ices, and sherbets.

3. Ice Cream Course for Plant Men
   January 12 to 24, 1953

   This is the regular two-week course in ice cream making.

4. Market Milk and Milk Supervision
   January 26 to February 7, 1953

   This course is designed primarily to assist the industry in obtaining informed personnel who understand the problems involved in the production, processing, distribution, and supervision of fluid milk and related products.

Details on these courses and on conferences at the School of Agriculture, The Pennsylvania State College, can be obtained by communicating with A. Leland Beam, Director of Short Courses, School of Agriculture, State College, Pa.