

be afforded. Each County will have the privilege of making a nomination, and if all avail themselves, and if we have the same number of ordinary students, it will only make a difference of forty students. As it is now, we provide that students who have experience on a farm, and belong to the Province, are admitted for \$20, and those who have no farming experience, \$30; in the case of those coming from outside the Province, those with farm experience will pay \$50, and those without, \$100. Thus we have, as far as possible, endeavoured to make it a condition that students should have practical farming experience before attending there. Reference has been made, and objection taken to the non-party complexion we wish the Board to assume. It has been presumed that we shall gradually compose the Board wholly of our political friends. The speaker repudiated the idea, and referred to the partisan character of the appointments of the Dominion Government under the License Act. He was extremely sorry that the suggestion had been made that the student who received the nomination would be looked on to that extent as a pauper. He did not think that anything of that kind might be expected to result. This was the course followed in some of the United States colleges, where in some cases each county is entitled to send one student free. The objection was also urged that there would be a great deal of wire-pulling to obtain the nomination. Both of these latter could not be correct. Persons would not be very eager to get a nomination if it would make them a pauper. Then there were objections to the salaries paid by the Government to the professors. This Government paid far lower salaries than were paid in the United States, where in similar institutions the President received \$5,000 a year as against \$1,800, and the professors only \$1,500, \$1,200, and \$1,100. He concluded by stating that the practice in the United States with respect to the creation of the Board was to appoint them.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. MERRICK contended that the Opposition should be restrained from criticizing the acts of the Government, because it was asserted that they were opposed to the Agricultural College. He did not think the results to the farming community were at all commensurate with the expenditure. One-third of the students were foreigners, at least they resided outside of the Province. He thought that Ontario farmers' sons should be admitted free and foreigners excluded.

Mr. AWREY said that from the establishment of the Model Farm to the present time it had received the hostile criticism of members of the Opposition. They had made the charge that the institution was not economically managed, but they had not pointed to a single expenditure to which they could object. While complaining of extravagance the member for Leeds had proposed to increase the burdens by making the institute free. (Applause.) Then the charge was made that "foreigners" received instruction at the College. Why, no higher compliment could be paid to the institution than the fact that foreigners chose to attend the College. Nobody complained that the university was not a paying institution. The one institution at which the attacks of the Opposition were directed was the farmers' College. He was in favour of the proposition to appoint an Advisory Board. He did not share the opinion that the young men who were selected by the County Councils to be educated freely at the College would be branded as paupers.

Mr. McCOLMAN said that the farm was not run in a practical and economical manner.

Mr. CREIGHTON said that proper criticism would advance the interests of the farm. It was not expected that the college or the experimental farm would pay, but the farm proper ought to pay.

Hon. A. M. ROSS—It's all experimental.

Mr. CREIGHTON, continuing, said he did not believe that the pupil who received free tuition would be considered a pauper; but he was afraid that the result would be that the young man whose father had the most influence in the County Council would be selected. He proposed that the young men should be selected by examination.

Mr. MEREDITH said that the Treasurer had unjustly attributed partisan motives to members of the Opposition. He spoke of the records of the two parties on the question of the Model Farm, and said that nine years ago the Treasurer had voted against a proposition similar to that which he was now making.

Mr. HARCOURT agreed that it was very desirable that politics should be eliminated from the discussion, but it was not right to say that the supporters of the Government had been the greatest sinners in this respect. One of the gentlemen opposite had described the institution as a "sink hole." He had

observed the great success of German farming, and he thought it was largely due to the agricultural education which Germany offered. In Germany to-day there were 150 schools of agriculture; Austria had 70 of such schools, with 2,200 students, and 174 agricultural evening schools, with an attendance of 5,500. France had 43, attended by 3,044 students. He had heard no grumbling about the farm among his own constituents, except from men who were politicians first and farmers afterwards. Two years ago the member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) had spoken in the highest terms of praise of the institution.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN reminded the members of the Opposition that they had voted against the appointment of the Agricultural Commission, whose reports had proved so great a boon to the farmers.

The Bill was read a second time.

A resolution fixing the fees of the members of the Advisory Board at \$4 a day was passed in Committee of the Whole.

AUDIT OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Hon. A. M. ROSS moved the second reading of the Bill to provide for the independent audit of the Public Accounts. The present auditor was an officer under the control of the Government. The proposal was to make him an independent officer of the House. The Bill was framed on the basis of the Dominion law, but there were differences arising from different modes of keeping the Public Accounts, the principle of the independent audit being preserved. There were certain restrictions under which the auditor must act. He had the power to say that no money should be paid without the Legislative authority. He was to keep an appropriation ledger, on which he was to enter all appropriations, and against each the expenditures which he considered to be chargeable to it; and he was not to allow over-expenditure, except in certain exceptional cases. But it would never do to make the auditor so independent that he would have the power to block all business. It was provided that in certain cases of emergency his decision might be overruled by the Treasury Board, but in such cases the matter must be brought before the House by an independent report of the auditor, who must include in his report the reasons given by the department and by the Treasury Board. If a difference arose between the Treasury Department and the auditor as to the appropriation against which a certain expenditure was to be placed the matter was to be submitted to the Treasury Board, whose decision would override that of the auditor. But in that case also he must report the circumstances to the House. The principle was that all unusual expenditures came before the House and became a subject of discussion there. In Ottawa they had large spending departments, each keeping its own bank account. It was intended that here all the business should be transacted by the Treasury Department, and all cheques should be issued by that Department, and not by any other Department.

Mr. MEREDITH—Does that extend to the Crown Lands Department?

Hon. A. M. ROSS—It extends to all the Departments.

Mr. MEREDITH—There will be a change in the present system?

Hon. A. M. ROSS—Yes. No money is to be spent except upon the cheque of the Treasury Department, countersigned by the Auditor. The system would be simpler than that adopted at Ottawa, but equally strict, so far as the examination by the Auditor-General was concerned. It had been represented that the Government had been dilatory in the matter. Their administration of the finances had, he believed, been satisfactory, but as soon as there was a demand for a closer scrutiny of the public accounts the Government had granted it.

Mr. MEREDITH asked for an explanation of clause 19, regarding payments in excess of appropriation.

Hon. A. M. ROSS said that this was intended to cover a case of emergency, such as an under-estimate of the amount required to carry on some public work, the stoppage of which would be against the public interest. In the Dominion Government the financial year closed on June 30th. They took their appropriation more than 12 months ahead, and it was a customary thing to ask for a vote to complete the service for the year, but here there was no such opportunity.

Mr. MEREDITH said if the Bill was to be of any service at all the appointee to the place of Auditor General should be one in whom the public had entire confidence, not a mere clerk nor one of partisan views. He observed that a provision contained in the Dominion Act was omitted for this Bill, namely, the one which stipulated that all the moneys of the Government should be deposited in one bank. He understood that this was the practice now, and although the Crown Lands Department had a separate account yet the money was