

Mr. BARR hoped that efforts would be made to obtain the statistics, which would prove of so much value in connection with the college. He thought the institution should be devoted exclusively to the purposes for which it was established, and that only those who intended to follow up the pursuit of agriculture should be allowed to avail themselves of its advantages. With this object in view, he suggested that students on entering should be required to declare their intention to devote themselves to agriculture on leaving.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) thought this was a good opportunity for considering the progress made by the Agricultural College. Whatever difficulties occurred in the early stages of the institution, he still held to the opinion that it was undesirable to give up until they had a better opportunity of judging from actual experiments what the results would be. He trusted when the hon. gentleman brought down his statement the House would be in a position to consider whether it was expedient to continue an experiment upon the large scale to which this was growing. For himself, he had not been able to see why the farmers and tax-payers at large should be called upon to bear a large expenditure in order to give a superior education to a few farmers' sons picked from here and there in the Province. It was absurd to suppose that any large number of the sons of agriculturists could avail themselves of the advantages of this school, and, therefore, unless those who were educated there signally distinguished themselves as pioneers in the art and science of agriculture, he believed that the hon. gentleman would find that public opinion would not sustain the House in granting \$20,000 annually to maintain an institution of this kind at one point of the Province. He was glad to hear that a larger number of farmers' sons were entering as pupils, and that a large proportion took up the business of agriculture after leaving the College; but he thought the hon. Attorney-General was too prompt in repudiating the suggestion made by his hon. friend (Mr. Creighton) that any benefit could be derived from suggestions made from the Opposition side of the House. The Government of course were responsible for the expenditure of public money, and were entitled to credit for any good measure placed on the statute book; at the same time, as a member of the Opposition, he claimed credit for any suggestions made and resolutions proposed by them in the course of discussions in the House. (Opposition cheers.)

Mr. FERRIS said that if the House had followed the advice of the members of the Opposition, there would not be one student belonging to the farming community in that institution.

Mr. LAUDER—The Government took the cue from the Opposition.

Mr. FERRIS said that if that were the case the farmers of the country had not followed the advice of hon. gentlemen of the Opposition who had pronounced the college a failure, and had attempted to turn the whole affair into ridicule, instead of meeting it by fair argument. Before many years, he ventured to say, this institution would be the most popular in the Province. (Hear, hear.) It was destined to produce the richest results to the community for which it was intended. It was a long time since the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Macdougall) left the farm—and he was never a very good farmer (hear, hear, and laughter)—and he (Mr. Ferris) believed that the hon. gentleman did not find even writing for the benefit of the farming community much of a success. He (Mr. Ferris) had taken some pains to enquire into the working of the farm, and he found it to be eminently satisfactory. It was supplied with that kind of stock which was the most beneficial for its purposes—that which was used on ordinary farms. He thought it would be a good idea for the Minister to give instructions that circulars should be sent to agricultural societies offering to supply farmers with such stock as the farm produced and which was for disposal. In that way, and others, the in-

stitution could be made of immense advantage to farmers. He thought it was not due to the farming interests of the country that it should be called an experiment, for he believed the intention was that it should be a permanent institution of the country.

Mr. FRASER supposed almost every gentleman in the House would admit that, at the present stage of the session, the discussion of this matter was rather premature, the detailed report of last year's operations not being yet before the House. The principal interest in the discussion was due to the fact that there was not much else to discuss. That, however, was certainly no excuse for hon. gentlemen of the Opposition in making assertions that were not borne out by the facts, and it was still less excuse for them in attempting to set aside the fruits of their own past actions. There was, perhaps, no objection to the remark of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Macdougall) that the College was an experiment. But the hon. gentleman had gone further, and condemned the Government for not accepting some suggestions made by members of the Opposition. In condemning the majority of the members of the House for voting down the motions made last session with reference to the Agricultural College, the hon. gentleman, from his own parliamentary experience, should have known that he wished to draw an inference which he should not draw. The sole object of those resolutions was to embarrass the Government, and they were therefore of necessity voted down (hear, hear), whereas the hon. member for South Simcoe wished the House and the country to infer that some innocent motions were voted down purely on their merits. The farmers of this country had very little to thank the members of the Opposition for in this matter. (Hear, hear.) From the time the present Government took charge of this institution, they had nothing from hon. gentlemen opposite but their indifference or opposition. Last session they were prepared to say that the institution was a failure, and that the Government should not attempt to extend its operations. Now, however, the hon. member for South Simcoe, wishing to curry favour with the farming community, took a slightly different ground. The speaker then read a motion proposed by a member of the Opposition at the last session to reduce the appropriation for the Agricultural College from \$25,000 to \$10,000, and remarked that had that motion been carried the accommodation of the institution would have been so limited that it would have become a failure of necessity. That was exactly what the Opposition wished. They desired that the field of the College should be so narrowed that the efforts of the Government to make it a success would be destroyed. That being the inevitable tendency of the motion, it was properly voted down. He read other motions put forward by the Opposition showing that they were framed with the evident purpose of having them voted down, and of afterwards using them as a handle against the Government. With regard to the students, it was not so much matter that they should be sons of farmers or merchants, as that their intention should be to follow the business of farming. The Opposition were entitled to no credit in this matter beyond that of borrowing the suggestions of the Commission. They wanted the field of selection limited, so that County Councils should each nominate a student, while the Government extended the limit by allowing Township Councils to propose students.

Mr. MEREDITH—When did that Commission report?

Mr. FRASER was not sure when, but it was long before the last session of the House, and he thought before the present Parliament. He went on to point out that if the views of the hon. gentleman opposite had been carried out, the accommodation of the college would not now be sufficient for the demands made upon it. The Government and its supporters had been the generous friends of the farming community in this country (Hear, hear, and laughter from the Opposition). The hon. gentleman opposite had voted to cut off the expenditure for this institution.