

Mr. LAUDER pointed out that the expenditure per pupil in the College was about \$400, while the actual vote only allowed them about \$260. The institution was a most expensive one, and the education received there cost more than in any other institution in the Province.

Mr. MEREDITH said that the manner in which the accounts of the College were kept deceived the people of the Province as to the way in which their money was spent. It appeared that an amount over and above that voted by the Legislature was expended in the College, and yet they had no details as to how that money was laid out. Who was to control that extra expenditure? He maintained that the salaries paid to the officials were altogether too large. A change had been made in the classification of the items of expenditure, by which the salaries paid to women servants were made to appear as expenses. He could conceive of no reason for the change unless it was a desire to make it appear that the salaries had been cut down, while such was not the fact.

Mr. WOOD said that the salaries paid in the College were no larger than in institutions of a similar character in the United States. The principal received \$2,000 a year, while the average salary paid to presidents of such colleges in the United States was \$3,300, and never less than \$3,000. He repelled the insinuation that any change had been made in the manner of classifying the items for the purpose of making a show of economy. The items referred to had been merely transferred to the head of expenses, with the effect, of course, of increasing that expenditure as much as the salary account was reduced. He contended that it was unfair to charge the interest upon the capital invested in the institution as an item of expense. Such a course was a new one, and was not employed in connection with any other institution.

Mr. MERRICK complained of the statements in the report from the School of Agriculture as being so general as to give no information as to the receipts of the farm. It was stated that certain receipts were derived from the sale of products, &c., but no details were given, and they were left in the dark both as to the way in which these receipts were obtained and the way in which they were expended.

Mr. GRANGE said that when it was considered that the farm contained 550 acres, that a large amount of labour was expended upon it and considerable produce raised, and yet that there had to be spent over and above the receipts something like \$21,000 for its maintenance, the farmers of the country would begin to think that it was a pretty expensive institution.

It being six o'clock the Committee rose and reported, and the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. MERRICK objected to the passing of the item until a detailed account of the extra receipts and expenditures over and above the annual vote was brought down. He thought such a statement might be prepared and given to the House by tomorrow.

Mr. CREIGHTON also thought that a statement of the moneys dealt with in the Agricultural College beyond the annual appropriations should be given the House. The extra amount might have been spent in supplementing the salaries of the officials, or in other equally objectionable ways, and the House had no means of knowing it.

Mr. MILLER did not see how it was possible for the Treasurer to give minute details of the working of the College upon such short notice. He was surprised to see representatives of rural constituencies sitting on the other side of the House, denouncing the Agricultural College, and thought they were doing the institution much harm by doing so. The farm was doing immense benefit to the young farmers of the country, and it was, after all, the agricultural interest that was the basis of the prosperity of the country.

Mr. MEREDITH protested against the method of keeping the accounts of the farm, and said that they on that side of the House were not opposed to the farm, but wished it to be efficiently carried on, so

that it might be of the greatest possible benefit to the country.

Mr. FERRIS said that the objection taken was not an unreasonable one; but if the Opposition would examine the report they would find all the information they required.

Mr. MERRICK asked the hon. gentleman when the amount paid to the pupils was given.

Mr. WOOD said that he had stated that the pupils were paid so much per hour, and that at the end of the year their wages often amounted to a sum equal to their board, and sometimes to more.

Mr. FERRIS contended that all the information that could possibly be given was set out in the report. The nature of the institution was such as to make it impossible to keep its accounts by such a method of bookkeeping as was required by hon. gentlemen opposite. The great desire exhibited by the farmers of the country to obtain copies of the annual report showed that they appreciated the work that was being done in the College. The experiments conducted there were of the greatest value, and he had been solicited for the reports to a much greater degree than he had been able to comply with. It was idle to talk of the pupils costing \$400 a year each, for if every item of expense were reckoned, students attending the higher educational institution cost very much more.

Mr. CREIGHTON maintained that the increased efficiency of the College was very much the result of the criticism from that side of the House. He pointed out that it was impossible to tell the exact amount allowed the pupils for their labours. The object for which young farmers went to the College was to learn how to make a farm pay, and how could they accomplish that end when at the farm they did not earn enough to keep themselves? Leaving out of account the salaries paid to the officials, the amount expended on the College was about \$11,000. It had been said that the experiments conducted there were of much value, but he would like to know what the millers of the country would think of the milling properties of wheat being ascertained by means of a coffee-mill. (Hear, hear.) If the farming experiments were conducted in a similar manner he did not think much reliance could be placed upon them.

Mr. MASSIE reminded the House that last session the hon. member for East Essex, supported by the hon. member for South Grey, had threatened to move a resolution that the farm should be sold, and the proceeds distributed among the agricultural societies of the country. There had been much improvement in the condition of the farm since its inauguration, and it was unfair to say that the officials of the institution should not be paid a fair remuneration. He thought that too much land had been bought for the farm, and considered that if two hundred acres were sold, and the proceeds applied to the erection of new buildings and the improvement of the existing ones, the efficiency of the institution would be much increased.

Mr. GRAHAM was glad to hear a member of the Opposition prophesying the success of the institution. He had no doubt it was expensive, but there never was a Government affair that did not cost rather more than it ought. He regretted that sufficient comparisons had not been made in the report. For instance, he would like to have seen comparisons made between lands drained and undrained. He suggested that next year a Committee of practical men should be appointed to look into the working of the institution in the summer. He was glad to see that the farmers were taking an interest in the College, and that farmers' sons were attending it more than formerly. He supported the motion cordially. (Cheers.)

Mr. HAY read from the report of the institution in Michigan to show that the salaries paid there were \$20,000 annually, and the total expenses \$46,000, independent of what was made out of the farm. The property represented a capital of \$310,000. He was sorry to see the Opposition trying to reduce the salary of the head of the College. That gentleman had to have an education equal to that of any legal gentleman in the House, and in the matter of intelligence