

hon. gentlemen opposite that tuberculosis had just come into the country. Why, he had had tuberculosis in his cattle many years ago, and had not isolated them and the disease had done no great harm. In fact according to the report of the Ottawa Experimental College, there would appear to be hardly a sound animal in Canada. Mr. Bishop read from the report showing that many apparently sound animals on being submitted to the test given evidence of the disease, and had been accordingly slaughtered. Tuberculosis was no more dangerous now than years ago. He thought the whole subject was brought up by the Opposition simply from political motives, and he was very sure that the discussions upon it in the House would not be to the advantage of the farmer, but would, on the contrary, tend to create the impression that all Canadian cattle were diseased.

Mr. S. White followed, and made a very severe attack on the Minister of Agriculture. The members of the House owed it to their constituents, he said, to tell the Minister when he erred, and he should not object to this being done. Mr. White continued to make various statements which Mr. Dryden was continually rising to correct amid the laughter of the House. He charged again that Mr. Dryden had ordered an infected cow back into her stall.

Mr. Awrey rose to a point of order at this juncture, and objected to such a statement going forth after a distinct denial on the part of the Minister.

Mr. White said he had not heard the denial.

Mr. Dryden then denied it again, and said he had only just denied the truth of the statement when made by Dr. Ryerson.

Mr. White said he had to accept this statement of course, and then challenged the Minister of Agriculture to deny various other statements reflecting on his management of the college.

Dr. Willoughby said Mr. Awrey had misquoted Prof. Saunders, which Mr. Awrey denied. In reference to the naming of the stock, whatever names they were given he ventured to say not a calf would be called "Honest John," because it would suggest the dishonesty of the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Dryden had mismanaged the college, and was responsible for the troubles that had occurred there lately.

Mr. Tait said he could not understand why hon. gentlemen so bitterly attacked the Guelph College and so carefully defended any allusion to the Ottawa College. He could only explain it by the hypothesis that they were always against the Province. Mr. Tait showed that Mr. Awrey's quotations from Prof. Saunders were correct. Dr. Willoughby had equivocated. He could understand some hon. gentlemen equivocating, but not when the equivocation was found out on the spot. (Applause and laughter.)

Mr. Meredith said he thought it would be a mistake if it went out that the Government did not regard this matter very seriously; that they regarded it in the same way as Mr. Bishop had done, for instance. The subject was a grave one. A special commission had been issued some time ago in New York to inquire into the matter, as Dr. Bryce, the Secretary of the Provincial Board of Health, mentioned in his annual report. Dr. Bryce, in his remarks on the question, had shown that he at least appreciated the gravity of the case. The subject was deserving of the closest and most serious attention. Mr.

Meredith denied that the Opposition took pleasure in attacking the college, but said the fact of the sale of the progeny of diseased animals was a proof of negligence on the Minister's part, and that was the whole point of the attack that had been made upon him.

The motion was then passed, having been, at Mr. Dryden's suggestion, amended in such a way that any information it asked for not included in the return called for a few days ago by Mr. McColl might be included in that return.

It being 6 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

The House, on reassembling after dinner, spent a business-like quarter of an hour despatching second readings with great celerity. No less than twelve bills were thus advanced a stage, viz.:—Mr. Harty's bill to confirm an agreement between Gananoque and the Thousand Islands Railway Company, Mr. Biggar's bill to confirm certain assessments of Trenton, Mr. Paton's bill respecting the railway debenture debt of Tiny, Mr. Allan's bill to consolidate the debt of Harriston, Mr. Davis' bill to reduce the area of Newmarket, Mr. E. F. Clarke's bill respecting the City of Toronto, Mr. Harty's bill respecting St. George's Church (Kingston), Mr. Charlton's bill to incorporate the Universalist Church of Ontario, Mr. Harty's bill to confirm a by-law of Kingston, Mr. McKay's (Victoria) bill to enable Lindsay to purchase the Lindsay waterworks, Mr. Tait's bill to incorporate the Canada Burglary Insurance Company (Ltd.), and Hon.

Mr. Harcourt's bill to allow James Henry Carpenter to practise dentistry.

At 8.20 o'clock the debate on the biennial sessions was resumed by Mr. Guthrie, who expressed great surprise at the side of the House from which the proposal of this great constitutional revolution had come. Yet it was appropriate, for it was a reactionary measure and came from a reactionary party. Of old the Conservative party of the day were opposed to frequent sessions, and Charles I. had persisted in this course until his head came to the block. The Reformers of that day had struggled hard and successfully for annual Parliaments. Mr. Meredith, in saying that the annual Parliament in England was necessary to pass the army vote, had confounded cause with effect in the most glaring manner; for the annual vote to the army arose expressly from a desire thereby to oblige the Crown to call Parliament every year. Quotations from Hallam and other constitutional authors abundantly proved this point. The annual session had been Parliament's great weapon in securing its rights and liberties. And now the Opposition were trying to part with this time-honored custom. It was selling one's birthright for a mess of pottage. (Applause.) The biennial session would save, it was said, \$50,000 every other year, and to save that Parliament was asked to give up part of the constitution. To save that sum they were asked to give up their close control over the executive. Therein lies the supremacy of the British system over the American. It is good to have the Ministers with seats upon the floor of the House face to face with the members to be catechized and examined upon every grievance and complaint. Their conduct of public service could be watched, their misconduct could be punished. These are the great points of the superiority of the British system, and it is just this characteristic which the Opposition are attacking. Heedless of the maxim that justice delayed is justice denied, they wished the House to loosen its control over the executive. Then, Mr. Meredith's assertion that most of the legislation could wait another year was incorrect. Mr. Meredith had selected this year, 1892, of all others, when there was a mass of important and useful measures, to bolster up his arguments in favor of a false economy. Mr. Guthrie enumerated many of these measures, specifying particularly Mr. Hardy's mining act, Mr. Gibson's insurance act, the succession duty act, and the act reducing the fees of county officials. Of course these acts might have waited for another year. They might have waited for 40 years, but it would have been greatly to the disadvantage of the community generally. The same story was found on an investigation of the legislation of other years. It all showed the same story of advancement and progress. As to the crudity of the legislation of Ontario, which Mr. Meredith had spoken of, was it likely that legislation would be any less crude if the Legislature met only once in two years and had only half the time to do its work? (Applause.) It was very easy to criticize in this way, and he was reminded of similar criticisms recently passed by some English Judges on a measure which was passed into law under the care not only of the greatest statesman of modern times but of one who had the aid of the best English Judges of the day. He referred to the English judicature act. This showed how worthless such a criticism was. Look at the great religious bodies and commercial and monetary institutions. They all found it necessary to meet once a year, yet the subject matters over which they had control were out of all comparison with those under the control of the Legislature. County Councils, Township Councils and City Councils all met very much oftener than once a year. There had been no petitions for biennial sessions, no agitation for them, and there never would be if the people were allowed to understand the full effect of what was proposed. One great advantage of yearly meetings was the knowledge that members were able to obtain of each other. They were able to get to know on whose judgment to rely, to know who was versed in municipal matters, who in business matters, who in those pertaining to the constitution, and so on. Meeting but twice in four years the members would not have this advantage. They would miss, also, as the Attorney-General had said, the inestimable advantage of training, for the Parliament would be over almost before the newly-elected members had had time to learn the rules. Mr. Meredith had spoken of the enormous number of members in all the Parliaments and Legislatures of the Dominion, and had mentioned the enormous cost of them all. Ontario had only to do with Ontario, and her legislators were far fewer in proportion than those of other Provinces. The number of legislators in the country could easily be reduced by the abolition of the Senate. If Mr. Meredith was sincere why did he not devote himself to this reform? Under the biennial system it would be possible for an