

the room occupied by the President's secretary. When Prof. Shaw's wife was coming to visit him, President Mills extended an invitation (which was accepted) to entertain her during her stay, and sent his carriage to the station to meet her, but another carriage was there and she was taken somewhere else. When President Mills afterwards spoke about it, Prof. Shaw simply listened and made no explanation. Still later he imagined that in consequence of a letter given to Colonel Clarke, the latter ceased giving his son a ride in his carriage, and took up Mr. Mills' boy instead. In the evidence, however, it appeared there had been no communication from Dr. Mills to Colonel Clarke, that such a thing had never been thought of by either of them, and that as a matter of fact Mr. Mills' boy himself had requested Colonel Clarke to take up Mr. Shaw's son, who was lame. Yet for a long period of time this imaginary grievance rankled in Mr. Shaw's mind, and so the thing goes on, the troubles becoming greater. It is greatly to be deplored that his work there has been marred in this way. He admits himself making a serious mistake buying cattle at his own auction sale for the college farm, contrary to the rules and the decision of the Advisory Board.

We must confess that we are unable yet to see any real reason why the staff should not have worked together harmoniously. Mr. Shaw was doubtless actuated by a strong desire to make a success of his work in the institution, and certainly had a capacity in getting through a vast amount of work, as was shown by the fact that he was able to earn at least \$900 in writing for various papers, in addition to his college work (laying his services "upon the altar of his country," as he puts it), for which he received \$2,000 per year. Having the advantage of direction from two such thoroughly practical and successful men as the two successive Ministers of Agriculture, the Hon. Charles Drury and the Hon. John Dryden, together with the advice of the Advisory Board, consisting of such successful farmers as John I. Hobson, John McMillan, M.P., E. Jeffs, J. S. Smith, G. B. Boyce, D. A. Dowling and Wm. Donaldson, he should have been able to have made a marked success in the farm department, and undoubtedly great improvement has been made there within recent years. We notice that he was very strongly urged in the direction of fixing the farm roads, cleaning up about the buildings, killing weeds, etc. On one occasion, when he had been advised to repair a farm road, he undertook, on his own authority, to improve the public road first, saying he thought that would have a better effect upon visitors. It would certainly have been much better all round, had he fallen in line with the able men who were associated in directing affairs at the farm, instead of resisting authority. It was most unfortunate also that he dropped into the habit of explaining (indirectly, perhaps, at times) to the students that he was hampered, or that he desired to pursue a certain course, but could not, because some one else in authority did not concur. Hon. Mr. Drury very early foresaw and clearly pointed out that this would prove destructive to discipline and demoralize the whole institution.

In his defence, Mr. Shaw charges the commission with partisanship, and with making an unfair report against him, explaining among other things that he was not aware of the existence of by-laws governing the institution when he took office. If he could not fall in line, it seems to us that the rational course would have been to have severed his relation with the institution.

With the exercise of a little more common sense, and the application of the "give and take" principle by Mr. Shaw, we believe this trouble would have been avoided, and the commission and its work would never have been needed. The students whose agitation brought about the investigation are entitled to credit for the light that has been thrown upon the weak points in the past conduct of the institution, and it is to be hoped this storm will clear the college sky and result in its doing still more effective work for Ontario agriculture.

The Toronto Empire on the College Trouble.

The Empire, of Toronto, very concisely sums up and disposes of the Agricultural College trouble as follows:—

"From the report of the commission that has been investigating the affairs of the Guelph Model Farm it is clear that the staff and students constituted anything but a happy family. Nearly everybody about the place was, if the commissioners are correct, conspiring against somebody else. The root of the trouble is alleged to be that Prof. Shaw desired to get control of the institution free from responsibility towards the president or the Government. For this purpose he was poisoning the minds of everybody against the president. The late resident master, Mr. E. L. Hunt, also had a knife whetted for Dr. Mills, because of the dismissal of the matron. A number of the students who had been rebuked by the president went around by way of revenge breathing slanders against him. The assistant chemist, who was in league with Prof. Shaw, directed his gun chiefly against the assistant resident master. The farm foreman made it his business to foment discontent among the students while they were in the field. The herdsman, who took sides with the president, was severely punished by Prof. Shaw for doing so. Indeed, he was given an assistant who was utterly helpless among the herd by reason of his abject fear of bulls. Under these circumstances the commissioners were quite justified in determining that there was a lack of harmony. That puts it very mildly. The institution was in a state of mutiny, and but for the timely intervention of the Government, strangely enough, at the instance of Prof. Shaw, it would have been necessary to call out the militia."

Findings of the Ontario Agricultural College Commission.

With reference to the charge of lack of harmony on the part of Dr. Mills, the principal evidence respecting the harmony of the staff and officers of the College prior to 1888 was given by the late assistant resident master, Mr. E. L. Hunt. He stated that the following officers were dismissed or resigned in consequence of a lack of harmony between them and the President of the College, Dr. Mills, namely, Professors Brown, McMurrich, Robertson, himself, Bursar Deacon, Farm Foreman Woods, and Matrons Mrs. Speight, Miss Dunn and Mrs. Martin.

The Commissioners regret to be compelled to report that Mr. Hunt gave his evidence in a most unsatisfactory manner, apparently with one object in view, namely, to injure the President, towards whom he admitted having very bitter feelings. His evidence at times was conflicting and contradictory on important matters.

It was apparent from his own and other evidence given upon the subject that he had been influenced against the President by Mrs. Martin, when matron, and that this feeling became intensified upon the dismissal of Mrs. Martin. He has apparently been doing all in his power to poison the minds of one or two of the officers and several of the ex-students against the President, and was one of the chief agitators for this investigation.

Upon the evidence of Dr. Mills, Prof. Robertson and others, your Commissioners are of opinion that Mr. Hunt was entirely mistaken as to the relations of Dr. Mills and the officers named, other than Mrs. Speight, whose removal at the President's request was justifiable.

With reference to the lack of harmony alleged to have been caused by President Mills towards Prof. Shaw, your Commissioners are of opinion that the evidence establishes that wherever lack of harmony existed it was at first caused by Prof. Shaw's actions towards the President, in (among other things) talking against the ability of the President to outsiders, as shown by the letter written to him by Hon. Charles Drury, then Minister of Agriculture, a few months after his appointment, and his continued refusal to acknowledge the authority of the President.

The cause of the lack of harmony, was in the opinion of your Commissioners, not attributable to Dr. Mills, but to Prof. Shaw.

With respect to the conduct of Dr. Mills, it appears that Mr. Hunt stated to Sharman and others that he was an untruthful man, and that this statement was accepted by them and was their only evidence in support of the charge that the President was a false man. Three of the ex-students, namely, Buchanan, Brodie, and Sleightholm, stated that the reason they objected to the President was that he had found fault with them while in the College, having on one or two occasions called them names they considered improper.

Prof. Robertson, in his evidence, stated that he had found fault with the President in consequence of some matters of discipline, and the dismissal of Mrs. Martin. It was evident that Prof. Robertson had not known all the circumstances connected with the different matters complained of by him at the time he felt aggrieved. He spoke highly of the President in his position at the College, and considered that he was doing good work; and that he personally did not leave through any lack of harmony with the President, and that he never found it impracticable to get his work well done.

Prof. Shaw stated in his evidence that Dr. Mills was an untruthful man, but gave no instance of untruthfulness in support of this general charge.

Two or three of the present students and Mr. H. B. Sharman, the assistant chemist, gave evidence that the President was false, and alleged in support of that statement that the President had stated to the two gentlemen making inquiry into the late trouble against Mr. McCrae, the assistant resident master, that he did not know the minds of the third year students in that regard. This statement of the President's was undoubtedly true, for we find that in the evidence of Mr. Ferguson he gave the circumstances of the third year students agreeing to go before the President and state their feelings on the matter, but when they were before him, they declined to do so, and Prof. Shaw found fault with them for their action.

Another occasion stated by these students and Mr. Sharman showing the President to be "false," was in reading a telegram to the students from the Minister of Agriculture respecting their attendance at lectures prior to the investigation into the McCrae trouble. The telegram and papers respecting that matter bear out the President's statement that he read only what had been sent to him, and that the students and Sharman were mistaken.

Mr. John I. Hobson, Chairman of the Advisory Board in connection with the College, spoke in the highest terms of the President's character.

In our opinion the attempt thus made to defame and damage the good name of the President has utterly failed.

We are of opinion that the President has on certain occasions acted harshly in speaking to students, and possibly to some members of the staff, but the circumstances under which he did so evidently required such discipline. With reference to the instances of lack of harmony given by Prof. Shaw, first, those against the President, and second, those against the Minister of Agriculture, the evidence fully establishes the fact that Prof. Shaw had no ground for complaint whatever. The instances given were most trivial in their nature, and had evidently been previously made use of by him for the purpose of poisoning the minds of the students against the President and the Minister of Agriculture.

Your Commissioners find the evidence establishes that the President was justified in all his actions in the instances referred by Prof. Shaw, and that they were of a most trivial nature. We fail to understand how any gentleman of intelligence could look upon such matters as instances of lack of harmony on the part of the head of the Institution, whose duty it was to keep an oversight of all matters connected with the outside and inside departments.

We are of opinion that the real difficulty with Prof. Shaw was his desire to obtain full control of the agricultural department, without responsibility to the Minister, the President or any other officer. He persistently refused to be guided by the President, or to submit in any way to his authority from the day of his appointment up to the present time. The President acted within his authority given him in the by-laws in the instances mentioned.

In connection with the action of Dr. Mills in many of the instances above referred to, your Commissioners find that he was remiss in not upholding his authority over the agricultural department on all such occasions. Had he done so, we are of opinion that much of the present difficulty would never have arisen.

With reference to the instances of lack of harmony with the Minister given by Prof. Shaw, your Commissioners are of opinion that the evidence proves that Prof. Shaw was desirous of evading all responsibility to the Minister of the day. The letters written first by Hon. Charles Drury, and subsequently by Hon. John Dryden, fully prove the difficulties they had to contend with through the actions of Prof. Shaw. His replies thereto were in several instances most impertinent.

With reference to Barnett, the herdsman, while we are of opinion that the herdsman acted improperly, at least on one occasion, namely, with reference to the sheep pen, and that he expressed himself toward Prof. Shaw in a manner that was unbecoming, we find that it was the duty of Prof. Shaw, having charge of that department, to give such instructions to the herdsman as would enable him to attend to his duties efficiently. That Prof. Shaw admittedly declined to do, he blames Barnett for over-feeding, but is unable to give any instance in which that was done. He, on the other hand, neglected to make inquiry into the quantity of feed supplied to the stock by Barnett from time to time, and also refused to give detailed instructions as to the manner of feeding. He admitted that he seldom visited the stables to ascertain what was being fed, or the manner of feeding, or how the cattle

sheep and pigs were being taken care of. He appeared to judge that Barnett was over-feeding from the fact that the cattle were too fat and were unprofitable, and that the cost of feeding was much larger than formerly.

It is no doubt true that the cattle have been kept in high condition, but as stated by Dr. Grenside and Mr. Hobson, that was absolutely necessary for educational purposes, and especially necessary considering the position of the institution to the public, and the liability to adverse criticism in case they were not found in proper condition.

We are of opinion that Prof. Shaw, in connection with Mr. Story, the Farm Foreman, early took a dislike to Barnett, because, without reasons, they considered him to be a friend of the Minister of Agriculture, and believed him, as Prof. Shaw states in his evidence, to be kept there by the Minister as a spy. There was no evidence whatever to show that Prof. Shaw's belief had any foundation in fact. On the contrary, it was shown conclusively that Barnett received no instructions whatever from the Minister, nor was he there for the purpose of informing the Minister of any acts of Prof. Shaw or of any other officer in connection with the institution, but was retained by the Minister solely on the ground of his qualities as a herdsman and feeder of stock. These qualities are fully upheld by the evidence of Dr. Grenside, Veterinary Surgeon to the institution for eleven years, and by Mr. Hobson, Chairman of the Advisory Board since its inception.

We are of opinion that Prof. Shaw attempted to interfere with Barnett by endeavoring to impose upon him as his assistant an old man, who had acted previously as helper, and had proved himself utterly unfit for succeeding in consequence of his fear of the bulls. These facts were stated by Barnett to Prof. Shaw, and notwithstanding such knowledge the Professor desired to compel Barnett to accept him. Barnett was subsequently upheld in his actions in this matter by the Advisory Board.

With respect to finding fault with the Minister for purchasing stock in the Old Country on account of the expenditure, it appears that Prof. Shaw was aware of the stock being purchased. It appears that the Minister obtained an increased grant to cover the over-expenditure on account of such purchase, as shown in the Public Accounts for the year 1891, page 3.

With reference to his difficulties about the bulletins, we consider that, instead of finding fault, Prof. Shaw should have been grateful to the Minister and his Deputy for correcting the many mistakes therein, which, had they been published in the form presented by Prof. Shaw, must have been ridiculed by the public generally.

Respecting the assistance for work in his office, your Commissioners are of opinion that, while doing as much work as an ordinary editor (for which he received at least \$900 a year in addition to his annual salary from the Government, and without the knowledge of the Minister or members of the Government, or the President of the College), it still became Prof. Shaw to complain of overwork in the performance of his official duties under the circumstances. When the Minister of Agriculture propose to relieve him from the experimental department in order to give him more time for his remaining duties, he found fault with the Minister for even proposing it, and accused the Minister of insulting him by such proposition.

As to the complaint that he did not have an opportunity of purchasing stock in time for experimental work in one instance, the evidence produced by himself was that he wrote to the Minister for money on October 19, 1892, and his wishes were at once complied with, as soon as he accepted the conditions proposed by the Minister on which the stock should be purchased.

As to charging Prof. Shaw with being responsible for large over-expenditure, the evidence fully establishes that ever since his appointment the expenditure in his special department has exceeded the estimates.

Your Commissioners would respectfully refer to the record book kept by Prof. Shaw, in which he entered all matters that would have a bearing against the Minister, President, and other officers of the institution, in case an investigation should be held. This book is dated 28th October, 1889.

As to the conduct of Prof. Shaw, your Commissioners cannot condemn him too severely. We are of opinion that he has systematically poisoned the minds of students from the date of assuming his duties up to the time of this investigation against the President of the College and the Minister for the time being. His opportunities for so doing were facilitated, as he himself stated, by his working with the students in the fields and on the roads.

Prof. Shaw was warned by Minister Drury of the dangerous results of such conduct shortly after his appointment. It was pointed out to him by the Hon. Mr. Drury in a letter, dated December 13, 1889, that "nothing can be more destructive to the harmonious working of an institution than for any officer to fall into the habit of explaining to students that he desired to pursue a certain course, but was prevented from so doing because some one in authority did not concur with his views."

He won the confidence of the students in many ways, some by giving them employment at the expense of the Government as drivers, others by showing an interest in their welfare, and then mentioning his grievances, giving them to understand that he was a much abused man, and that he was unable to do for them what he wished, such as he would like because his powers were being curtailed by the Minister and the President, who were oppressing and hampering him in the way above indicated.

He has in this way shown a very marked and deplorable want of loyalty towards the Minister and the President, as well as toward the institution, and has done much to bring about the present feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest among the students and ex-students, he invariably making them believe that he was a victim and the Minister and the President his oppressors.

Your Commissioners have set forth in this regard certain facts that were proven against Prof. Shaw: first, the purchase of his own cattle after his appointment in the name of his servant, and without the knowledge or consent of the Minister or the President, and in direct violation of the by-laws of the institution.

We also find that he was guilty of gross neglect in not keeping a proper account of travelling expenses during the month of January, 1893, whilst on a tour in connection with Farmers' Institute meetings. We are of opinion that he received the sum of at least thirty dollars over and above the actual expenses incurred and paid out by him for the delegation during this tour. His explanations as to the discrepancy in the accounts were most unsatisfactory, and fail to account for the overcharges. The manner of rendering the account was well known to himself, and there were columns for putting down the items that he claimed to have paid out, but he neglected or ignored the same. He kept the account, according to his own evidence, carelessly on slips of paper, which he afterwards destroyed. His evidence on this subject was contradictory in many respects, and although six months had not elapsed from the date of expenditure to the time of giving his evidence, and all that expenditure made within fifteen working days, he stated that he could not remember how the sum of forty dollars over-expended was incurred other than by a general statement that he had paid out all he had charged.

Your Commissioners opened the investigation in Toronto, on June 14, 1893, in consequence of a number of the students being there attending to receive their degrees prior to their departure for home. This was done for the purpose of obtaining their evidence, and also saving expense and delay in bringing them before the Commission from their various homes. After examining such students and two or three others who attended on June 14 and 15, your Commissioners adjourned to the College, and continued the examination of witnesses on June 16. Prior to commencing such examination at the College, your Commissioners publicly referred to the examinations in Toronto and the reasons for holding same. Prof. Shaw was present when such announcement was made. His son was examined in Toronto and was present during the examination of nearly all the other witnesses there, and from