

Canada had achieved in the markets of the world, which showed how rapidly Canada was moving onward in all departments of agriculture. Now, the hon. gentleman had compared the amount paid for salaries and wages at the college for 1893 with that paid ten years ago. In 1883 the amount paid in this way was \$22,046, and last year the amount so paid was \$36,007, an increase of \$13,961. Now, how had this increase been made up? By far the greater part of it was to be credited to the new services that had been instituted. The figures for the different items were as follows:—New dairy service, \$5,600; experimental, \$1,300; assistant chemist, \$575; horticulturist, \$560; tutor and shorthand writer, \$300; bookkeeping, lectures and summer school, \$560; assistant gardener, \$500; assistant carpenter, \$600; assistant librarian, \$225. All these were items connected with the new services, consisting of the dairy department, the travelling dairy and the dairy school, and made up a total of \$10,520. Of the balance \$1,939 was to be credited to increases of salaries paid in 1883, and \$1,511 to wages to employees, who had become necessary owing to the increased area of the ground cultivated. Mr. Dryden discussed these different items, defending each of them, and showing the reason for which the expenditure had been incurred. He thought no members of the Opposition would seriously argue that the expenditure for these new services should not have been incurred. It must be admitted on all hands that these expenditures were necessary if the institution was to continue its usefulness. As to the amount paid for wages, they might be thought high. He had thought so himself when he took charge of the department; but it had to be remembered that, whereas a farmer would allow \$8 a month for board, this figure had to be increased when the board had to be obtained in a city; and the wages paid at Guelph included board, reckoned at \$12 per month, and it was not possible to reduce them. The hon. gentleman had compared the salaries of the teachers at Guelph with those paid in Collegiate Institutes in various places. This argument had been already very effectively dealt with, but he wanted to say that he thought the comparison was not a fair one to make at all. A man could not be expected to take the position of President of such an institution as the Guelph College for the same salary as the Principal of a High School. The Principal of the Guelph College had been, he was almost sorry to have to admit it, for ten years past practically director of Farmers' Institutes' work, for which the State of Michigan had an officer with a salary of \$2,200. So that the President of the Guelph College had practically saved this amount to the Province. Mr. Dryden mentioned the prominent part taken by the professors at the college in connection with the travelling dairy. A fair comparison might be made with the salaries paid at the Ottawa Experimental Farm, and it would be seen the salaries were much higher than at Guelph. Prof. Saunders received \$4,000 and a free house. Prof. Robertson, who used to get \$2,000 at Guelph, and was given \$3,000 to go to Ottawa, had had his salary increased to \$5,000, besides a house, and other professors got \$1,400 each and a house. At Lansing Mich., the President got \$3,000 and a house, and twelve professors \$1,800 and a house each. At Cornell, N.Y., the agricultural professors got \$3,000 each and no house, and in other States the figures were higher yet. The President had been offered \$4,000 a year to go to the United States, but had preferred remaining here. Several graduates of the college had secured positions with salaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$2,000. Mr. Dryden then turned to Mr. Clancy's criticisms of the stock department of the college. The hon. gentleman had said he wanted to be fair by taking the figures from 1888 to the present, because in 1888 a Minister was appointed. But the Minister was appointed about mid-summer, and so only half the year was under his supervision. He might have taken a year earlier, 1887, but it would not have suited him so well. Prof. Brown was there in those days, and the stock was valued at a higher figure than it was really worth, and very much higher than it would be worth now. A Shorthorn bull, for instance, in 1887 was valued at \$1,500 and in 1893 at \$200, and a Hereford bull in 1887 was counted worth \$2,000 and now only \$100, though for all practical purposes as good as that of 1887. In this way 161 head of stock in 1887 were valued at \$15,153, and 250 head in 1893 were valued at \$8,497. In 1888 the buildings were burned and there was a forced sale. It was unreasonable to expect the two sides of the account to balance. If this were desired the kind of animals kept would be very different. There were, for instance, ten breeds of cattle, nine breeds of sheep and five of swine. The object of the variety was educational, and this applied to the principle on which the whole farm was conducted.

The expenditure of the Ontario Agricultural College might be compared with that of the Dominion Experimental Farm. He

was aware his friends opposite thought that the management there was all that was to be desired in the way of economy, and so it might be timely to compare the expenditures of the two institutions. He would leave out the dairy expenditures of both, as they extended over the whole Dominion in the one case and the whole Province in the other. The Dominion institution has no college, and so he would leave out the salaries paid to the inside professors at Guelph. The farm expenditure for 1893 of the Dominion Experimental Farm was \$42,735, that of the Ontario Agricultural College \$21,138, while the revenue at Ottawa was \$2,553, as against \$4,240 received from the Ontario Experimental Farm. The Ottawa farm is 466 acres, the Guelph farm 550 acres. He was not charging the Dominion institution with extravagance; he was merely holding that if charges of extravagance were made against the Ontario Agricultural College they would apply with three-fold force against the Dominion Experimental Farm. As for the attendance at the college, the attendance would never be what it should be so long as the college was dragged into the arena of party strife; the misleading charges would prejudice many persons who did not see both sides of the case. If a persistent attack on Upper Canada College, its professors and its work were made its attendance would suffer. But notwithstanding all charges made, he could tell the House that the attendance was steadily increasing, and at the present moment was greater than it had ever been before. The farmers were visiting it personally, and as a result were sending their sons more and more; this, too, in spite of the existing depression, which makes it difficult to spare their sons for the whole three years. The students themselves were in love with the institution. It was one of the best equipped institutions on the American continent; it was held in high esteem by farmers of the Province, by those qualified to judge on the other side of the line, and by the English farm delegates who have inspected it.

Mr. Dryden then referred to the Farmers' Institutes. He was sorry to see the unjust attack made by Mr. A. F. Campbell; it was a pity to see this institution, one of the best existing for the benefit of the farmer, decried for political effect. There was not a farmer in the House who had had experience with the Farmers' Institutes who would not testify to their value. The charge was made that most of the grant was paid out to political favorites of the Minister as delegates. He denied the charge in toto and called upon those making it for proof to show where one particle of political influence had been used. He did not know many of the delegates chosen; they were selected for their ability and agricultural knowledge. He knew a number of them were Conservatives who were qualified for the position. Why were these attacks made on him through each and every session? There were two reasons; one was because he happened to be a farmer; it was a terrible thing for a farmer to be in the Cabinet.

Mr. Whitney—Who said so?

Hon. Mr. Dryden—That is said in effect by the hon. gentlemen. They can scarcely discuss any question but the Minister of Agriculture is attacked. The second reason was that he dared to go out into the country and make speeches on political topics. Three years before he had made a speech on trade relations, which had apparently caused the attacks.

Mr. Clancy—Was fault found with the speech because the maker was a farmer?

Hon. Mr. Dryden—Yes, it was. It was because I am a farmer, and it was feared that I might therefore gain the ear of the farmers.

Mr. Clancy—Was that why you made the speech?

Hon. Mr. Dryden replied that he had nothing to take back about the speech; the arguments had never been refuted. If it had not hit some one there would have been no complaints. He did not care what the members opposite thought about him so long as he knew he was approved of by his fellow-farmers. He knew he was a marked man because of his going about and addressing the farmers, but he was not afraid of the hon. gentlemen who went down into his constituency; he was not afraid to submit the record of his department to the farmers of his riding, nor was he afraid to submit it to the votes of the farmers of the whole Province. (Applause.)

#### THE FEE SYSTEM.

Mr. A. F. Wood continued the debate. He began by paying a high compliment to Mr. Harcourt for the ability displayed in the budget speech, but agreed with the criticisms of the preceding speakers on the part of the Opposition. He referred very briefly to Mr. Dryden's speech, remarking that while Mr. Dryden had accused all the gentlemen on his side of the House with assailing him, he, as a matter of fact, had not referred to him during the