

and fed them in the winter on hay containing that weed. We took other animals which had been living in the country and which no doubt had eaten the weed and carefully segregated them, put them on a pasture which had no weeds in it and fed them on hay which had no weeds and they all lived and thrived. We tried this two years, putting in different animals, and feeding them differently, so as to test it in all ways and we came to the undoubted conclusion that the disease was the result of the eating of this weed. If that is the case it is no longer proved to be a contagious disease and we therefore felt we had no longer a right under the Contagious Diseases Act to pay compensation and we passed an order in council a little while ago ceasing to pay compensation. We found in the course of our experiments that sheep are not affected by eating the weed, and we are trying to see whether we cannot stock that piece of land with sheep who will eat off the weed and destroy it. We have had sheep there for a year and a half and they are as healthy as when they went there. They have pastured on the weedy field and eaten hay containing it and seem to be none the worse. We have also a few goats there, and they eat the weed. We have not been experimenting long enough to say definitely but we hope to be able to recommend the farmers to kill the weed in that way, by having sheep eat it off.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I understand that a similar disease was found to exist in New Zealand and that the New Zealand government took systematic steps to prevent the spread of the weed and to assist in its total destruction. The proposed solution of the difficulty by having farmers pasture sheep on the fields to kill off the weed seems to me to fall short of what is required, and I would like to impress on the minister the great importance and wisdom of formulating a plan by which, working with the municipal authorities, some extra effort should be put forth to secure the removal of the cause of the disease. I think resolutions were forwarded to the minister, they have been to me, asking that something of that kind should be done. The minister will see that before a complete transition from one class of animals to another can be obtained in a locality, a long period would elapse and in the meantime the disease would continue to exist.

Mr. FISHER. I would be very glad indeed, in any way I properly could to aid in the destruction of the weed. It is a rather large undertaking for my department to undertake to destroy weeds in the country and while this weed happens to be peculiarly hurtful to cattle there are many other weeds all over the country that are very hurtful. I can assure my hon. friend that I will be only too glad to see if I can work out a scheme by which I can do something

provided it does not lead up to too great complications in other portions of the country.

Mr. STAPLES. In connection with this item I wish to call the attention of the minister to what I consider is an unfair discrimination against Manitoba as regards the slaughtering of horses for glanders. I discussed that matter to some extent at a previous meeting of this committee. I have before me a list that I received from the Manitoba government covering the cases from September 1, 1904, to January 25, 1905. This government took over dealing with glanders, and paying for horses slaughtered for that disease, on September 9 or 10, 1904. But they did not take over this work in Manitoba until January 25, 1905. Between these dates, 58 horses were slaughtered for the disease in Manitoba. The people of Manitoba, I repeat, have paid their share of the moneys required to compensate during this period all over the Dominion of Canada. I cannot understand why the minister still refuses to compensate those who have been so unfortunate as to have had their horses slaughtered for the disease in Manitoba. As I look over this list, I see many persons who are known to me. Many of them have been reduced to rather hard circumstances in order to carry on their farming operations by the great loss they have sustained by having horses slaughtered. I think there should be means by which this government might propose a special vote in order to give these gentlemen at least \$75 or \$100 a horse. Many of them are poor men, and I feel that I am not asking for anything unreasonable or unjust,—simply fair-play for the unfortunate farmers, whose names appear on this list. I suppose the minister will say, as he has said before, that legally he cannot do this. I suppose he will say, as he has said before, that the province of Manitoba did not consent to hand over to him the care of this disease until January 25. But I have gone into this matter very fully with the provincial minister, who had this matter in charge, and he informs me that there was no desire to withhold from this government the control of this matter—in fact he was only too glad to hand it over to this government. I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) again to reconsider the decision he has given, and, by a special vote make allowance to these unfortunate farmers who had their horses slaughtered.

Mr. HERRON. What was the aggregate value of the horses?

Mr. STAPLES. That does not appear in the statement I have, but I suppose the value of these horses would not be more than from \$100 to \$250 each, and some of them would be even less. I should think that \$10,000 at the outside would be a fair value, and a