

Mr. MACDOUGALL—The Dunkin Act is in force there.

Mr. BETHUNE—But I suppose there are people there who think they are perfectly justified in disobeying the Dunkin Act. At any rate, that Act does not prevent the people from giving champagne or any other cordial to their friends; all the Dunkin Act presumes to do is to prevent the sale of intoxicating drinks in small quantities. (Cheers and laughter.) That is one of the weaknesses in connection with the Dunkin Act, and I dare say it may be this fact which accounts for the extraordinary speech made on the occasion referred to. (Laughter.) Mr. Bethune went on to say that no member should make an attack on any party in the House unless he was perfectly sure he was in the right.

Mr. LAUDER—Who is to decide whether he is right?

Mr. BETHUNE—He ought to be perfectly convinced in his own mind that he is right. The mere fact that a partisan rises in his place to make a partisan statement does not absolve him from the serious responsibility of stating that which he does not believe to be true. (Cheers.)

Mr. MACDOUGALL—Does the hon. member mean to say that non. gentlemen on either side of the House do this?

Mr. BETHUNE—I do not refer to any particular member. The rules of the House do not permit me to do so. But I know that from both sides things are said for partisan purposes which the particular partisan who gives utterance to them knows at the time are wrong. (Order.) I am not referring to any particular person; my object is simply to point out that the present attack is made for purely partisan purposes. (Cheers.)

Mr. LAUDER—It is made for no such purpose.

Mr. BETHUNE—Of course everybody knows that the hon. member for East Grey has no partisan motive in such matters! He simply seeks this information for the public good. (Laughter.)

Mr. LAUDER rose to a point of order. It was improper for the hon. gentleman to impute wrong motives to any member. Such a course was contrary to the principle laid down by the Attorney-General, was a violation of true moral principles, and, more than that, was a violation of the rules of the House. (Opposition cheers.) The hon. gentleman had better be called to order at once, as it was impossible to foretell where he was going to end.

Mr. SPEAKER—We have a rule that no hon. member shall reflect on the House.

Mr. BETHUNE was obliged to the hon. member for calling him to order, but he wished to point out that he had not reflected on the House, but simply on a few members on either side. (Laughter.) He was glad to be able to bear testimony to that effect. (Great laughter.) But he would pass to the consideration of the main question—was it right that the fund should be administered in the manner that it had been administered? We must have superior education in a country like this, and such institutions as those attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite were a real necessity. He was glad to hear that the number of students at the Upper Canada College had increased of late and was still increasing. (Hear, hear.) They might point to the University with pardonable pride as the institution at which the Hon. President of the Council was educated. (Cheers.) Though he (Mr. Bethune) belonged to the Presbyterian Church, he would be the last to place the slightest embargo on the University, which ought to be carried on irrespective of creed. Institutions of this character might be in operation for years before their full fruits would appear, and now that we were just getting the best crops from the early sowing, it was too bad that his hon. friend should lend his distinguished name to a charge of incompetency in the management of the University. (Cheers.) If hon. gentlemen opposite were satisfied there was any mismanagement, why did they not ask for a commission of enquiry, and remedy any grievance that might be found to exist? (Hear, hear.) In considering

such a question, non. gentlemen should rise above mere sectionalism. The College was by no means a Toronto institution. Every boy, whether he came from Cornwall or Windsor, was entitled to the same privileges as the youth of this city; indeed, those pupils who came from outside paid smaller fees than the Toronto pupils. (Cheers.) The hon. member for South Simcoe spoke of a surplus from the University of Toronto. There was, in fact, no surplus, and the reason was that University College was at present starving. (Hear, hear.) The Senate was not able to equip the College as they would like; they were not able to pay the salaries they ought to pay. While judges obtained from \$4,000 to \$6,000 a year, the professors in the College, gentlemen of equal ability, and who had spent their lives in fitting themselves for their work, were paid from \$2,000 to \$3,000 per annum. He thought this was unjust. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MACDOUGALL wished to point out that under the head of salaries the University expended in 1876 \$34,618, while for scholarships, which he understood the hon. the Minister of Education to say was three-fourths of the University expenses, only \$4,400 was spent. That did not look as though the institution was starving.

Mr. CROOKS said the salary expenses were those of the College, while the scholarship expenses were those of the University.

Mr. BETHUNE contended that the institution was starved, and it would never become efficient until larger salaries were paid. He pointed out that the scholarships were for the benefit of poor students from the country.

Mr. MACDOUGALL—I do not complain of that. I complain that it is too little in proportion to the amount paid for salaries.

Mr. BETHUNE said that because it was so little the hon. gentleman proposed to make it less. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

He wanted to distribute it among different denominations, or in some such way. The University was doing a work of the greatest national importance, and it would be unfortunate to cripple its movements. He did not wish to disparage the other universities, for he thought they were all doing a good work, and the professors in these were also too poorly paid. All the different universities in the Province, he thought, ought to be consolidated into one large institution in Toronto. The large number of students that would thus be brought together would lead to greater competition, a higher standard of training, and the best professors that money could get would be obtained. This was the reason Harvard University was the best on this continent. It was attended by between 600 and 700 students every year, who enjoyed the common advantage of the instruction of the best professors who could be secured. It would be a misfortune to the cause of higher education if this trust were taken away from the University, or the control over it which the Senate now possesses in any way lessened. The House had now all the check on that fund that was required. These gentlemen knew that they were subject to the Government, and were liable to be called to account for any improper expenditure. The only fault found was that they had put up a very handsome building—a building which was highly necessary, and surely the money could be spent on no better object. (Cheers.)

Mr. SCOTT pointed out that the statute required the Senate of the University to lay an annual return before this House. They had not done so, and when the hon. member for East Grey made a simple motion for such a return, political motives were imputed to him. He did not think the intention of the motion was to denominationalize the endowment fund, or that any gentleman on his side of the House desired any such thing. Speaking for himself, he certainly did not. This fund, he contended, should be under the control of the House the same as other public moneys. It was once a prominent plank in the platform of the Reform party that money should not be appropriated for any purpose by an Order in Council without the consent of the House. The railway fund of a million and