

to reduce it in that sweeping manner which is the intention and the idea of the gentleman making the motion. We must not reduce the expenditure in a way which would reduce the value of the experiments. For the matter of a little money has no comparison, as far as importance is concerned, with the need of

MAINTAINING THE EXPERIMENTS

at the present high standard. It is, I say, a matter of immense importance that we should keep the experiments at such a standard as to ensure respect for their accuracy and thoroughness. We have never expected any revenue from these, and it would not be wise to do so in the future, but I can assure the House that due economy will be observed in carrying on the farm and college. I ask the House, therefore, for a further expression of its confidence by voting the motion down. Now, another thing the hon. gentleman referred to was that we expended in repairing implements and waggons, and for blacksmithing, something like \$5,000, and that there was nothing to show for it. I suppose we cannot show any practical results in connection with those expenditures. He might be able to do it, but I do not think anybody else could. Then he said we had spent \$5,000 for hardware, lumber, and labour, and he asked what was there to show for it. In the first place, \$350 was paid for portable fencing and lumber. Then we spent on the experimental buildings some \$2,090, on dairy, \$200; on chemical laboratory, \$800; on bull shed, \$350; on fat cattle shed, \$230; and for taking water and gas to the chemical laboratory, \$510. There is a total of \$4,500 that accounts for the hardware and labour and lumber referred to. The hon. gentleman must know that the expenditure is not merely for the sowing and reaping, but that we have, year by year, to expend a very large amount in

IMPROVING THE FARM.

A large amount has been paid out in cleaning up the place, in draining and fencing and erecting new buildings, and there will in future be a considerable expenditure in connection with the buildings, because those who have visited the Farm will have seen that the buildings are not new and that they must be kept in a reasonable state of repair. Year after year we have been urged to undertake the erection of new outbuildings such as would be a credit to the Province. That would probably involve an expenditure of \$30,000, and we cannot afford it just yet, although I think we will have to undertake it some day. Now I think I have drawn attention to all the points of the hon. gentleman that there was any force or value in. I could not attempt to follow him in the interminable mass of figures which he presented to the House. He has been studying them in the Public Accounts, and has been poring over them for days. But I would say, why does the hon. gentleman ask for this committee of enquiry? Could any committee of enquiry during the session begin to make an investigation as to the mode of management of the Agricultural College? In fact, his resolution only deals with the financial management, and we have a committee already to investigate anything of this kind—that is the Public Accounts Committee. That is their duty. If there is anything wrong, any discrepancy; if there is any Department in which the expenditure is not shown, it is peculiarly and absolutely the duty of the Public Accounts Committee to investigate these. We are considering the suggestion which has been made, that the farmers should themselves have some direction in saying what experiments should be carried on. We are considering whether we might not have an Advisory Board of Farmers with regard to the Farm, and I have been making enquiries regarding that. They have been organized in connection with some of the Agricultural Colleges in the States. I intend to consider the matter, and see whether it would be practicable or not. I am satisfied of this, that the House will concur with me in saying that the hon. gentleman has made out no case; that his whole attack, because it was an attack upon that institution—an institution which is peculiarly the farmer's—has failed. With regard to the Military College, maintained by his friends at Ottawa at an expense of \$70,000—an institution which is conducted to train officers—he has no word of condemnation. He makes no attack on his friends for that, and no committee of enquiry is asked; but the only institution which the farmers have in this country—an institution which is carrying on a work that they appreciate highly—is singled out of all the others, and not by the farmers themselves, but by those who are not engaged in the pursuit of agriculture. I hope the farmers on that side of the House will frown down any attempt to cut down the expenditures on the Agricultural College. It is doing a good work, and the Province would be penny wise and pound foolish if it would do anything that would interfere with the practical work that is being done there. I will not say more, but will close by moving in amendment to the resolution:—

"That all after the first word 'that' in the original motion be omitted, and that there be instituted therefor the words 'The Standing Committee on Public Accounts has ample power and authority to inquire as to the financial management and administration of all the Provincial institutions.'"

I do not shirk inquiry, but court it to the fullest extent, and I will give the hon. gentleman the amplest opportunity of summoning witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee and of employing a clerk to have the evidence reported,

but the House would be doing a wrong to the institution—would be casting a slur upon it—if they were to pass his resolution, and it would be a vote of want of confidence in the Government to say that a committee of enquiry was necessary so long as you have the Public Accounts Committee. (Applause.)

Mr. DRYDEN said he understood the hon. gentleman was in the publishing business, and should have issued his speech in the shape of a pamphlet, because, judging from the attention with which it was listened to in this House, it would have commanded a very large sale, and he would no doubt have derived a handsome revenue. (Laughter.) It seemed to him that the hon. gentleman had forestalled the work of the Committee of Enquiry altogether, and that as he had gone over the whole ground it would be useless to go further in the direction of investigation. He (Mr. Dryden) was not altogether sorry that some discussion should have taken place in reference to the college and farm, because it would show those professors connected with the institution that the representatives of the people in this House were watching them. He quite agreed in the idea that the education should be mainly

PRACTICAL IN ITS CHARACTER.

The young men sent to this college ought to receive an education such as would enable them to go away and start farms for themselves. The hon. gentleman argued that this farm does not give all the young men in attendance a practical education, and his argument was based on the fact that the expenditure was greater than the receipts. He (Mr. Dryden) apprehended that the Agricultural College was not run like his own farm, for the purpose of making money. It was purely and simply an educational institution. The hon. gentleman had also shown us the cost of the institution to the country, but he did not include all the good that the Province was receiving from it. Let it be remembered that this is an experimental farm; that its experiments are embodied in the reports sent out annually, and one reason why he (Mr. Dryden) had favoured the doing away of the Provincial Exhibition was in order that more of these reports might be printed and distributed among the farmers. These reports contained hints of great value, which enabled farmers, perhaps, to pursue some course which would be beneficial to them. We all say that agriculture is one of the greatest interests that we have; that, indeed, it stands at the very foundation of all our prosperity, and if this be true surely if anything can be done to enable farmers to produce more it will be an advantage to the country as a whole. There were, perhaps, no other reports issued by the Government which were so greatly in demand, not only by the farmers, but by others as well. He was quite proud of the position which the institution had attained, and he had a right to be proud as a "son of Ontario." It had attained an influence that had not been paralleled by any other institution in this country. The reports issued from it were quoted not only in our own Province, but in other countries as well, and it would surely be wrong for us to take any action which would injure the influence of these. The hon. gentleman says this Committee will do no good. He (Mr. Dryden) thought it would do a very great deal of harm. It would give out the impression that things were going to the bad there, and they would find that leading farmers who were inclined to send their sons to the College would say, "If it is going like that I guess we had better not send them." He was very glad to hear the statement of the Treasurer that he proposed to curtail the expenditure as far as possible, but he would have been very sorry if that had not been coupled with the other statement that he did not propose to curtail it in such a way as to cripple the usefulness of the institution. He apprehended that this College had only begun to show its usefulness in the country. Hon. gentlemen would remember that there had been a

GREAT DEAL OF OPPOSITION

to it all along. There were those perhaps who felt that it was not doing a work commensurate with the expenditure, but he believed the majority felt that it was a useful institution, and that it was doing a great deal of good, and he hoped that the House and country would be prepared to stand by it in order that its efficiency might increase. Supposing there were some extravagance, he thought the Hon. the Provincial Treasurer was quite correct when he said that the proper committee to investigate this was the Public Accounts Committee. He therefore desired to move that there be added to the amendment these words:—

"And this House, therefore, leaves with that Committee the considering of and proceeding with any enquiry of that character with reference to the Ontario Agricultural College and Farm, which, in the opinion of the Committee, may be necessary or expedient."

Mr. BRODER asserted that the Government admitted that there was a necessity for inquiry, and that the Public Accounts Committee had the power to conduct it, but they did not say that it had the time. He proceeded to state his belief that the young men at the College were not farmers' sons, and that they were not fit physically for farmers. The fact of this institution being an agricultural one, and one for the farmers, the Government ought to be sure that their statements of experiments were correct and, continuing, endeavoured

to point out that they had been greatly remiss in their duty in this respect. He complained at some length of the bad quality and inefficiency of the productions of the creamery, asserting that 20 per cent. of the butter exported to England was absolutely bad and unfit for use. Even an excessive outlay should not influence the Government in designating which source of revenue was the most encouraging, the manufacture of cheese or butter. The experiment would no doubt be of advantage to the agriculturalists of this Province, and one which he hoped would receive attention from the management of the institution.

Mr. BALLANTYNE introduced his address by an indignant protest against Mr. Broder's attack on the students at the College, and stated that as far as he was concerned his two sons did not answer the description of the hon. member for Dundas. The pressure of his business had prevented him giving to their farm education the time it required, and but for the College he would not have been able to fit his sons for the effectual prosecution of their profession. The hon. gentleman had not done well in reflecting upon the young men attending college. In consequence of two members of his family attending, he had taken a great interest in the college, and had had the opportunity of seeing many of the students, and he assured the House that they did not answer the description of the member for Dundas, and he had no hesitation in denominating the attack as unfriendly, ungenerous, unfair, and untruthful.

Mr. BRODER was understood to say that he had been informed that the young men were not farmers' sons, and were not physically fit to be made into farmers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE—I should not have uttered such a slander upon the young men upon hearsay evidence, and I think it was due to the House that the hon. member for Dundas should have investigated the statements before he had given currency to them. Dealing with Mr. Broder's speech, he defended the creamery against Mr. Broder's attack, showing that the latter had only criticized minor details, and showed that for the short time it had been in operation it had done well. The whole argument of the member for Dundas, said he was, urging the necessity for improving the dairy products of the country, especially butter, and if there is one article more than another which experimental stations have improved it is butter. Danish butter, as he knows very well, is in unlimited demand in England at very high prices, and that is the result of establishing stations and conducting experiments such as we have done at Guelph. While our climate may not be so well adapted for butter making as Denmark yet we hope to improve the quality very much and thus create a demand for our butter at enhanced price. While we have been improving our cheese product and increasing the export we were going steadily behind in butter, and it was absolutely necessary for us to do something. It was quite hopeless to expect any improvement from private dairies, and the only way open was by the establishment of public creameries. There is no way of keeping up the productive capacity of a farm other than by manuring, and the only way to get that is by keeping cattle. The breeding of cattle was the only way in which the intelligent young men could be furnished sufficient intelligent occupation so as to keep them on the farm, and by the improvement stimulated at the college the young man could be made to see that farm life was something more than mere drudgery. He showed that it was necessary in order to give the young man a thorough education in matters relating to stock that the farm shall have a supply of all the leading breeds, and as there could not be a large herd of each it was impossible to keep them profitably. He concluded by remarking that the Farm and College had done a noble work, and he hoped the report would be scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Mr. WILMOT said he was not going to find fault with the experimental part of the institution because he did not understand it, nor with the professors, who were genial men and no doubt well chosen. He objected to buying feed for cattle.

Mr. WATERS said if the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Wilmot) would turn to page 217 of the Agricultural College report he would find a statement of a

SERIES OF EXPERIMENTS

that had been made for eight years, covering no less than twenty different modes of feeding cattle, and he would find the net result to be that the rate of gain per head per day was 2.02, and the cost per pound of added weight ten cents per pound live weight, and by turning to the next page he would find the market prices of grain averaged up for these eight years. He had figured up how the thing would come out, while some of the members were talking to weight, and he found that by purchasing a bullock weighing 1,000 lbs. for \$45, and by feeding him for 150 days with the same average result as shown in this statement, which he believed was an accurate statement, there would be \$30.30 added to that cost price, or it would be worth \$75.30 for an increase of 303 lbs. Supposing the animal were sold at 6c. it would realize \$78.18, a net profit of \$2.88. The accuracy of these experiments, accompanied with tests made by some of the best farmers in England and Scotland, was apparent, as the results were quoted there when agriculture was far in advance of this country. The experiments proved that if a farmer receives more for his animal than