

necessary precautions were not taken to identify it in the packing plants. But more recently we have found tuberculosis even in our buffalo herds, which are never in the stable at all. Consequently the fact of the animals being always out in the sunshine does not seem to ensure absolute immunity from the disease. It has generally been accepted in the past that T.B. in cattle is a stable disease just as in the human family it is a house disease; but we will have to modify our views in that respect because the disease does attack them to the same extent as it does animals more or less confined to stables. The fact that tuberculosis is more general among dairy cattle, which are kept in the stable more than any other cattle, shows that the spread of T.B. is attributable to stable conditions.

Mr. LOVIE: In the event of a breeder having less than ten pure-bred animals and having enough grade cattle to bring his herd up to the requisite number, would he be entitled to the benefit of government inspection of his herd?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not sure upon that point. I think he would be, because there would be no use of testing the pure-breds unless the grades were submitted to the same test. Speaking from memory, I think the grades would count as part of the ten.

Mr. LEADER: I know there is great danger of contamination at fairs if the proper precautions are not taken—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no question about it.

Mr. LEADER: —and I realize that unless all the breeders co-operate with the department in carrying out the provisions of this act we will not get the best results from it. A great many of the fair boards in the United States now are adopting the plan of not allowing any cattle to be exhibited unless they can show a clean bill of health in regard to tuberculosis. I think a similar stipulation is very desirable for this country, and I would suggest where exhibition boards are given grants from the federal treasury that they be notified that within one or two years the grants will be withheld unless they stipulate that all cattle shown at their fairs be subjected to the tuberculosis test.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is worth considering.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.
[Mr. Motherwell.]

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 112 to amend the Irrigation Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Water areas may be leased for mining purposes:

Mr. STEVENS: I think we ought to have a pretty complete explanation of the necessity of this amendment. While it looks comparatively harmless, it may have a very far-reaching effect.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No difficulty has arisen to date—I am anticipating perhaps that a question will be asked as to the reason for the retroactive clause at the end of the section—but it has been pointed out by the Justice department that difficulty may arise under the Dominion Lands Act, particularly in relation to mining leases. Under section 7 of the Irrigation Act there is possibility of conflict because that section provides:

Except in pursuance of some agreement or undertaking existing on the thirteenth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, no grant shall be made by the Crown of lands or of any estate therein, in such terms as to vest in the grantee any exclusive or other property or interest in or any exclusive right or privilege with respect to any lake, river, stream or other body of water, or in or with respect to the water contained or flowing therein, or the land forming the bed or shore thereof.

We are advised to do this by the Justice department.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not suppose this has anything to do with the famous Hoppe lease controversy?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. STEVENS: Certain orders have been passed that some people have called in question in connection with that famous controversy, and I was wondering whether this might happen to be of the same stamp.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. Unfortunately nowadays apparently the Hoppe lease figures in any amendments that touch mining regulations.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, it looms up.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One can scarcely conceive of an area of 1920 acres, which is the area granted for a mining lease, in which there would not be a body of water, and difficulties might arise as to the rights of