

servative principles, he would have known that the endowments of such institutions as the University and College could never be interfered with with the sanction of the Conservatives. (Cheers.) The speaker proceeded to defend the administration of the institutions during the Sandfield Macdonald regime, and afterwards blamed the Government for employing an American architect for the erection of the new building. It was the duty of the Government not to detract in the slightest degree from the usefulness of the University, but to make it more useful for the people. He deprecated the idea of having a number of small universities whose degrees would confer no honour beyond the bounds of Ontario, and expressed his willingness to favour any steps which would make the existing institution one for Canadians to be proud of. (Cheers.)

Mr. MOWAT said it was a matter for rejoicing to the friends of the University and Upper Canada College to hear the strong terms in which the hon. member for East Toronto had spoken in their favour, and the rebuke which that hon. gentleman administered to the member on his left (Mr. Macdougall) would, he was sure, meet with the entire sympathy of the country. (Cheers.) With a good deal of what the last speaker had said he entirely concurred, but with a few things he could not so cordially agree. The hon. gentleman thought it right to avail himself of the opportunity to have a fling at the Ministry, but there was no more foundation for his present charges than there had been on other occasions when he had attacked the Government. (Hear, hear.) It had been intimated that the Government had been guilty of some impropriety in not bringing down annual returns, and it was stated that they had justified themselves on the ground that the Sandfield Macdonald Administration had been guilty of a similar omission. Now, the Government did not plead Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's errors in justification of their own. He was afraid their errors would be enormous if they followed the errors of which that gentleman was guilty. (Cheers.) The provisions of the statute requiring these returns to be brought down had been overlooked, and they had also been overlooked by the hon. gentleman opposite. But the omission to bring down those annual statements did not originate with the hon. gentleman opposite. For years past the accounts had from time to time been sent in by the University and College authorities, and had not been brought down; so that this practice had prevailed for a number of years. Whether Conservatives or Reformers were in power, the omission had continued. He supposed the reason was that all parties were satisfied, from the knowledge given through various sources, that the monetary affairs of those institutions were well conducted, and assuming that the provisions of the statute had come to be overlooked. However, when any hon. member desired that the returns should be brought down no one could make any objection. The hon. member rather defended the political allusions made on the present occasion by charging them to the policy adopted of having a Minister of Education. He said that by having a Minister of Education our relations with the educational interests of the country entirely changed, and that that change led to the attacks made here to-day. The hon. gentlemen forgot that the appointment of a Minister of Education had not changed their relations with the University or the College. It had in some respect changed their relations with the High and Public Schools, but the authority given in regard to those institutions mentioned was precisely the same now as it was before the Minister of Education was appointed. It was satisfactory to know that while hon. members opposite had been making a complaint as to the improvements made upon the Upper Canada College buildings, they had not disputed the necessity for that improvement or suggested that it was not done economically. But it had been said they had no right to make those improvements. It astonished him to hear learned lawyers making a state-

ment of that kind. The hon. member for East Toronto must know that the statute by which the annual expenditure was regulated contained also a provision for applying part of the capital of the endowment for the purpose of erecting permanent buildings. It was thought some thirty years ago, when the Bill for throwing open the University and regulating its future management was introduced, that it should not be accompanied by provisions requiring the Government to come down every year to obtain express sanction for the yearly expenditure. It was thought that the fund should be treated as any other trust fund was treated, and when the Bill of 1852 or 1853 was passed, no alteration was attempted in this respect. Those institutions are supported out of endowment funds, and no part of them could be appropriated for other purposes, and that being so the mode of administering them had received the sanction of all parties, and experience had shown that the plan worked well. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) objected that the architect for the building was an American. It might comfort the hon. member if he was informed that the architect was an Englishman. (Cheers.)

Mr. CAMERON—My objection is that he was brought from the United States.

Mr. MOWAT said that the architect was not even brought from the United States, although he was perfectly willing to bring anything good from that country. The architect referred to lives in Sandwich.

Mr. LAUDER—His office is across the river. (Laughter.)

Mr. MOWAT said the architect has considerable practice in the Western Peninsula, and Englishman as he is, and living as he does in Canada, even the Americans found it to their advantage to employ him. If they were an American State Legislature, and were employing Mr. Lloyd, he could understand such an objection, but he thought they should be rather proud of the fact that this English architect should be recognised and employed on the other side. In conclusion, he remarked that the Government had great pleasure in agreeing to the motion.

Mr. BELL said in the hands of the House both the endowments were secure. He, however, objected to the building, because he thought the site should have been used for new Parliament buildings. Neither did he agree to the Government bringing architects from outside the Province. If his information was correct, the architects employed were in business in Detroit, and they were paid 2½ per cent. for improvements on the original plans.

Mr. DEACON moved that the motion be amended by the addition of the following words: "Also a statement showing the annual number of graduates of the University that were sent up from University College, and the annual number of pupils who have passed through all forms of the Upper Canada College since 1867."

Mr. MACDOUGALL replied at some length to the attack made upon him by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bethune). He could not but admire the warmth and zeal of his hon. friend on his right (Mr. Cameron), who, he had no doubt, was an old Upper Canada College boy, with a great affection for his Alma Mater. For himself, not having that privilege, and looking at the question from a broad standpoint, and believing that the institutions had not been well conducted, although he might be approaching high Conservatism with rapid steps, he had not yet reached that point that he could see an abuse without any disposition to have it remedied. (Ministerial cheers and laughter.) He went over the arguments of his previous speech, and urged that there was no just ground for believing that the House would not adequately support the cause of education if its financial features were under its control, and would not add to any endowment which might be necessary in order to place the country on as high an educational pedestal as any other country. The Government should take the Legislature into their confidence in this respect, and the University would then occupy a much higher place in the confidence of the people than it does at present.