

in this matter for he was anxious to follow them. There had been nothing that had confused him so much as the report of the Board of Agriculture, because he had much respect for it, and he could not account for the way in which they had spoken of the Mimico farm. He had no doubt that the Government would remove the site, and it placed him under some difficulty in opposing them, for he would have to account to his constituents for his course, and he would be prepared to do so. He never shrank from doing his duty, and if he voted for the removal of the site he would be throwing a stain, he felt, upon the memory of one who had governed the country faithfully and well.

Mr. DEACON said he had read the reports on the subject of the Agricultural College, and from them he could not come to the conclusion that the site at Mimico was as bad as represented. He had read also the analytical report of the Michigan professor, but he had not much faith in experts; he would rather take the statements of the people living in the neighborhood of Mimico. If the soil was so bad there how was it that the people in that locality managed to live? He thought the whole thing had been "cooked;" that a great deal of time and trouble had been taken to gather evidence prejudicial to Mimico and none to get evidence in its favour. Perhaps the next Government would get a professor to go to the Stone farm and find "tuogstatus" in it, and a lot of other things that the House did not understand. (Laughter.) It was a great pity that if Mimico was so bad some other place in the vicinity of Toronto was not chosen; for people from all sections of the country visited this city at times, and I would perhaps like to visit the college and see how the operations were conducted; but they were not going to travel up to Guelph to do so. In the face of the slim evidence prejudicial to Mimico he did not think the Government should remove the site from that chosen by their predecessors. He was sorry that on this occasion he should have to vote against the Government, for he had hitherto supported them.

Mr. COYNE regretted that the Government had thought proper to deal with the question under discussion as a party one. One of the objects sought for in selecting a site for the Agricultural College was that it should be within easy access of Toronto; and the present Government did not pretend to say that another site could not be found in the county of York for the institution, and in that way alone an injustice was done to this section of the country. The statements and reports sent out by the Commissioner of Public Works had done much to depreciate the value of land in the neighbourhood of Mimico. He charged that the Commissioner had sought to prejudice members of the House against the present site by holding out the inducement that another might be found in their own constituencies, while at the same time he believed the Commissioner had fixed upon Guelph as the site.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) spoke of the great importance that ought to be attached to the reports of the Board of Agriculture and the persons selected to report on the subject. In the face of those reports no Government would have dared, no site having been selected, to have fixed the site at Mimico. As no work had been done on that site he claimed that it was the duty of the Government to see that some other place was selected. The Guelph farm was from all the evidence supplied to the House by far the better one of the two, and would save \$47,000. He considered that the action of the Government in making the question not an open one was the correct one, and that the Government should in all such cases take a bold stand and accept the consequences.

Mr. SCOTT (Grey)—That makes it a party vote.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) said that the Reformers of the House might, perhaps, vote differently upon this question, but the party of the honourable gentleman would vote as one, and it did not become him to speak about a party vote.

Mr. FERGUSON supported the motion of the member for East Toronto.

Mr. DEROCHE said that one of the arguments of the hon. gentlemen in favour of the Mimico farm was that the land there was very poor. If they wanted bad land they could come down to Addington, where they could get as bad land as they wanted, and cheaper than at Mimico. He believed that some hon. members intended voting tonight from a feeling of loyalty to their dead leader, but he believed that there was a feeling of loyalty to the interests of our country which should have greater weight with all members of the House. In case this College turned out a failure the farm at Guelph and the build-

ings on it could be disposed of for the price paid for it, whereas the Mimico farm could only be sold at a loss, and a still greater loss would be incurred if an expensive building was erected there.

Mr. ROBINSON had always been opposed to the establishment of an Agricultural College, believing that a very large outlay would be made without an adequate return. He thought, however, that if we had a model farm at all we should have a good one. He would therefore vote against the motion of the hon. member for East Toronto, and for the motion of the hon. member for North Hastings.

The members were then called in, and Mr. Cameron's motion was lost on the following division—Yeas 31, nays 40:—

YEAS—Messrs. Cameron, Macdonald, Ferguson, Ardagh, Meredith, Merrick, Boutter, Rykert, Lauder, Deacon, Grange, Coyne, Craig (Russell), Calvin, Monteith, Tooley, Scott (Grey), Read, Code, Guest, Fitzsimmons, Corby, Craig (Glengarry), Hamilton, Richards, Gifford, McCall, Patterson, Barber, Crosby, and Boulton—31.

NAYS—Messrs. Mowat, Crooks, Scott (Ottawa), McKim, Pardee, McKellar, Gow, Williams (Hamilton), Hodgins, Smith, Baxter, Farewell, Clemens, Cook, Gibson, Gibbons, Webb, Springer, Clarke (Wellington), Deroche, Clarke (Norfolk), Monk, McLeod, Oliver, Wilson, Striker, Paxton, Christie Sexton, Fairbairn, Wells, Graham, Robinson, Harrington, Caldwell, Snetsinger, Waterworth, Sinclair, Finlayson, Haney—40.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria), stated that he had paired against the amendment with Mr. McRae for it;

Mr. FAREWELL said that it was with great pain he felt compelled to make a motion which was against the leaders of the party which he honoured and with which he had always been connected. He intended to move that the model farm be removed to Whitby, and regretted that the prospect was before him of unseating the hon. leader of the Government, for whom he had often worked and whom he so highly respected. (Laughter.) He said that the site at Whitby was better and much cheaper than any other in the Province, and proceeded to expatiate upon the size, beauty, and adaptability of Trafalgar castle for the purpose required. The building at Guelph was not at all suited for the purpose. He moved an amendment to the amendment to the effect that the site of the College should be fixed at Whitby.

Mr. CAMERON said that as he believed that the Whitby building and site were preferable to those at Guelph, and as he believed the selection of the latter site by the Government had been made on other grounds than in the interest of the country, he would have to vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for South Ontario, although he regretted being compelled to support any motion of that hon. gentleman considering his action in this matter.

The SPEAKER ruled the amendment out of order as not being pertinent to the amendment, but applicable to the original motion.

Mr. RYKERT moved in amendment that it was the opinion of this House that if the Agricultural College was not to be at Mimico that Woodstock should be selected as the site.

A division was had and the motion lost, being voted for by only the following members:—Messrs. Rykert, Meredith, Lauder, Calvin, Corby, Craig (Russell), Monteith, Tooley, Scott (Grey), Oliver. Yeas, 10; nays, 57.

Mr. MERRICK moved a similar amendment in favour of Ottawa, which was negatived. Yeas, 5; nays, 56, the yeas being Messrs. Merrick, Rykert, Monk, Craig (Russell), and Macdonald.

Mr. RYKER moved a further amendment that a site should be selected within a radius of ten miles from, on account of its proximity to, the capital of the Province.

This amendment was declared lost on the following division:—

YEAS—Messrs. Cameron, Macdonald, Ferguson, Meredith, Merrick, Rykert, Lauder, Deacon, Grange, Coyne, Gifford, Richards, Ardagh, Fitzsimmons, Code, Guest, Calvin, Craig (Russell), Tooley, Monteith, Boulton, McCall, Crosby, Patterson—24.

NAYS—Messrs. Mowat, Crooks, Scott (Ottawa), Deroche, McKim, Pardee, McKellar, Gow, Williams (Hamilton), Hodgins, Oliver, Baxter, Smith, Clemens, Barber, Clarke (Wellington), Springer, Webb, Farewell, Gibson, Gibbons, Cook, Striker, Paxton, Wilson, Clarke (Norfolk), Sexton, Fairbairn, Christie, McCall, Monk, Wells, Sinclair, Ardagh, Graham, Caldwell, Finlayson, Hamilton, Harrington, Hanley, Snetsinger, Waterworth, Robinson—43.

Mr. PATTERSON moved in amendment to the amendment, that owing to the conflicting nature of the information afforded to the House respecting the quality of the land