

The House then divided on the amendment, which was lost. Yeas, 21; Nays 60

YEAS—Baxter, Boulter, Broder, Creighton, Currie, Grange, Hardy, Hargraff, Harkin, McLaughlin (Middlesex), McManon, Masale, Meredith, Merrick, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Rosevear, Ross, Snelinger, Tooley Willis—21.

NAYS—Messrs. App eby, Baker, Ballantyne, Barr, Bell, Bellhune, Bishop, Bonfield, Brown, Cameron, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Code, Cole, Counts, Croka, Dawson, Deacon, De Roche, Ferris, Flayson, Fisher, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Kean, Lane, Lauder, Lyon, McCraney, Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, McKee, Miller, Monk, Mostyn, Mowat, O'Donoghue, O'Sullivan, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxson, Richardson, Robinson, Scott, Sexton, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Waterworth, Widdifield, Wigle, Williams, Wilson, Wood—60.

Mr. CREIGHTON moved in amendment that the following be added to the resolutions:—"This House regrets that the Government has not recommended for the consideration of the people's representatives the expediency of granting aid to that portion of the Toronto, Grey, and Bruce Railway between Weston and Orangeville."

The SPEAKER ruled the amendment out of order, on the ground that it indirectly involved a charge upon the public revenue.

After some discussion

Mr. CAMERON appealed against Mr. Speaker's decision.

The vote upon the Speaker's ruling was postponed to a subsequent stage of the resolutions at the request of Messrs. Haney, Scott, Hodgins, and other members, who desired to investigate the authorities as to whether such an amendment should be regarded as involving a charge.

The motion for the reception of the report was then adopted, on the understanding that if the House sustained Mr. Speaker's ruling, Mr. Creighton's amendment should be allowed at a future stage.

Mr. PARDEE moved the first reading of a Bill founded on the resolutions. Carried.

ROCKWOOD ASYLUM.

Previous to the motion of Mr. Fraser for the House to go into Committee of the Whole upon the resolution respecting the Rockwood Asylum,

Mr. CAMERON enquired what was the staff employed, and the extent of the contracts.

Mr. FRASER said that they had the usual medical superintendent, staff of nurses, engineer, and burser. The contracts extended only for the year, so far as he knew.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) enquired if the cost of taking over the Asylum would be extravagant.

Mr. FRASER said that the building was the best of the kind in the Dominion. It would cost \$96,500, and accommodate 300 patients, at a cost of about \$250 per patient.

The Committee having considered the resolution rose and reported.

CONCURRENCE.

The following resolutions were concurred in:—For Civil Government, \$1,900; Legislation, \$5,800; Administration of Justice, \$1,245; Minister of Education, \$4,500; Maintenance of Public Institutions, \$8,850 04; School of Art and Design, \$600; Hospitals and Charities, \$4,944 63; Miscellaneous Expenditure, \$43,524 16.

On the motion for concurrence in the grant of \$15,000 to the School of Agriculture,

Mr. SCOTT moved an amendment to the effect that the County Councils should have the patronage of the School.

Mr. WOOD thought the hon. member's amendment impracticable. There may be some fifteen vacancies this year, and there are some forty odd county councils: they would have to decide upon fifteen out of probably forty nominees.

Mr. MERRICK thought it a wrong principle that the recommendations of the Administration should alone be entertained. He had recently been to the school, and he gathered from the Principal's words that the prospects for the future were not encouraging. The result of the operations on the farm proper had shown a profit of about \$1,000. It took besides this sum a sum of \$17,000, and the interest upon the capital sum invested annually to educate these forty-four pupils. He thought if it was to be continued the counties should have the privilege of saying that one of their communities should be educated there.

Mr. MOWAT said that the statement that the Government exercised patronage was quite unfounded. No one in the Government had the slightest knowledge of the politics of any of the pupils there. He would be extremely glad to have the County

Councils sending nominees were it practicable. The case was somewhat analogous to the Normal Schools, and no one had ever thought it practicable for County Councils to nominate scholars to these institutions. He would like to see pupils from all parts of the country instead of their being from only a section of the country.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) did not consider that for the County Councils to nominate the pupils would be impracticable. The Councils were responsible to their constituents, and it was for the Government to set the machinery in motion. The change would excite great interest in the school. The experiment was tried with success in the United States, of giving the Senators from each State power to nominate one pupil to the college at West Point.

Mr. ROSS did not think the statement that many of the pupils came from cities was correct. He perceived from the returns that out of 40 pupils 34 came from the counties. He thought that if the proposed change were made one-half of the counties would make no applications, so that the Government would then have to step in and fill up the vacancies in the school.

Mr. CREIGHTON said that the admissions to the school were not properly regulated, and a large number of the pupils were not farmers' sons. The Principal himself, in his speech made during the visit of hon. members to the school, admitted this, and stated that out of the forty pupils only nineteen were farmers' sons. He moved an amendment to the amendment, to the effect, "That the House regretted that the policy pursued in making admissions to the college had been such as excluded a large proportion of farmers' sons, and recommended that in future admissions be regulated so as to give the preference to farmers' sons, so as to make the institution what it was designed to be."

Mr. LAUDER contended that the inference to be drawn from the remarks of the Principal on the occasion of the recent visit was that the reason why so few farmers' sons were in the institution was because this class were not preferred over others owing to the opposition of rural members. He (Mr. Lauder) contended that the majority of the members from the cities had not supported the institution.

Mr. MEREDITH said he did not understand that the Agricultural College was established exclusively for farmers' sons, but for the benefit of those of any class who proposed engaging in farming.

Mr. MASSIE said the remarks of the Principal had been tortured and twisted from their intention. He (Mr. Johnston) had simply stated the difficulty he experienced in choosing between the recommendations of members who had opposed and those who had supported the institution. He had also experienced the difficulty of deciding whether applicants really intended to become bona fide farmers. He (Mr. Massie) was quite sure that Mr. Johnston was a conscientious and painstaking officer, who faithfully endeavoured to carry out the objects of the institution.

Mr. HARDY said that the newspaper reports of the Principal's speech did not pretend to be verbatim, and did not convey exactly what he meant. What he meant was that the institution found more favour with the representatives of cities and towns rather than with those from the rural constituencies who had been against the institution—a fact which embarrassed him in granting admissions to the school. The Principal also said that if the institution failed it would be the fault of the farmers. The hon. gentleman proceeded to point out that it did not follow that because a member lived in a town he must necessarily not recommend the sons of farmers. He had no doubt that in due course the farming community would take as great an interest in the institution as the mercantile community.

Mr. OAKLON said it was felt that the institution had so far proved a failure, and by giving the power of nomination to the County Councils new vitality would be thrown into it. He himself was, however, opposed to the idea that the institution was solely for farmers' sons, but thought that those who wished to adopt farming as a pursuit should be admitted. He contended that by enlisting the support of the County Councils in favour of the institution as proposed by the amendment, greater interest would be excited in the country districts.

Mr. HODGINS said that the amendment really conveyed a censure of the Principal.