

September 15th the game would disappear from the southwestern part of the Province. During the season he presented a number of petitions in favor of limiting the number of ducks to be shot, and also against the exportation of game from the Province. He thought the provisions against trespassing were too harsh.

Mr. Balfour thought the provisions of the law were too stringent. While sportsmen were in favor of such stringency, no doubt, the people would object to such restrictions. The provisions which would suit one part of the Province would be offensive to other parts of the Province. There could never be a satisfactory game law until the Province was divided into districts. In Michigan the duck season began on September 1, and the Canadians would see Americans shooting ducks for two weeks before they could. He thought the season for ducks should close on the 1st of January, as at present, instead of December 15th. He thought the provisions against trespassing went too far altogether. The penalties were excessive.

Mr. Monk approved of the bill, and thought that such legislation should have been introduced years ago.

Mr. Miscampbell said the provisions against foreigners were rather severe. It was not Americans who slaughtered the deer. It was the people living in the neighborhood.

Mr. Caldwell said that clause 7 would make every farmer a protector of game, would interest them in the preservation of game, and would assist very much in the enforcement of the law. He thought hunting with dogs should be abolished or limited to one week. The penalties, he thought, were not too severe. The measure on the whole was the best ever placed before the House.

Mr. Tait was opposed to the section providing for the killing of dogs. It would be a dangerous power to give to anyone. One of the best provisions in the act was that protecting the game on a farmer's property.

After some further discussion the bill was read a second time.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton) presented the following returns: Report of the Fruit Growers' Association; report of the commission regarding the claim of Proton in Grey for certain money spent on public improvements.

#### AFTER RECESS.

After recess Mr. Hardy moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Municipal Act. The chief amendments were those relating to the drainage clauses, and Mr. Meredith expressed the opinion that it would be better to postpone action on this point until the report of the commission is received. After some further discussion the bill was read a second time.

Mr. Ross moved the second reading of the bill to amend the act respecting the federation of the University of Toronto and University College with other universities and colleges. It was read the second time.

#### UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

Upon the motion to go into Committee of Supply, Mr. Meredith rose to move an amendment with respect to the expenditure upon Upper Canada College. He reviewed the legislation of 1837 putting the college on a new footing, and said that the funds of the college and the University of Toronto belonged to the Province and not to the trustees. Parliament in 1879 took into its control the entire expenditure on capital account, and it was provided that orders in Council should have no force until assented to by Parliament. In 1857 the House agreed to give the endowment of Upper Canada College to the University of Toronto, but out of the endowment there should be retained a sum not to exceed \$120,000 for a new building for the college and \$100,000 as a fund for maintenance. The whole amount to be borrowed was limited to \$200,000. He said that the Minister of Education gave the House to understand in 1887 that the cost of the building would be \$120,000 and the site

\$20,000. Afterwards the Minister found he could not purchase a site for \$20,000, and an order in Council was passed authorising the expenditure of \$35,000 for purchase of the site on Avenue road. The House in March, 1888, assented to this additional expenditure. But the Minister had no authority to spend, as he did, \$20,000 on the improvement of the site. The Minister entered into a contract for a new building for \$137,000. In addition, \$13,000 was spent on a commercial course, \$4,000 on a laundry and \$5,500 on an engine room. In all \$319,451 was spent on the site and new building. In the \$88,427 spent on equipment were the sums spent on water supply, plumbing, heating, etc. There was no power in the trustees to spend any of the surplus moneys. Only \$155,000 was authorised to be spent. There was no authority whatever for the expenditure of the additional \$160,000. Even if there was an order in Council, it would have been waste paper until confirmed by the House. It appeared from a return that the money borrowed from the university for the college cost the Province 6 per cent. This was strange, because the account of the university at the Bank of Commerce was overdrawn by \$157,000. The Minister had no authority to borrow money from the university and pledge the credit of the Province for 6 per cent. There was authority to spend \$155,000, but over \$319,000 was spent. There was no authority for expending the balance of \$160,000. There was never a grosser departure from the true principles of liberal government. He called upon the House to rebuke the insolent disregard of the people's representatives. He therefore moved in amendment that it appears from the returns presented to the House that there was expended on the buildings and site of Upper Canada College, including \$14,649 for furniture, the sum of \$319,451, and that this sum was in excess by \$150,000 and upwards of the amount authorised by the Legislature, and such additional expenditure, besides being unauthorised and illegal, is in violation of the compromise reached with respect to the continuance of the college, and on the faith of which the House assented to the erection of the new college buildings.

#### MR. MOWAT'S REPLY.

Mr. Mowat said that the hon. member, in bringing this matter up in the way he had, had prevented effectually a counter resolution expressing the facts of the case. He had presented the subject in a rather ingenious way, hoping thereby to embarrass some of the friends of the Government. He would leave the details of the reply to the hon. Minister of Education, but he would say that there was no suspicion that one cent had gone to any other purpose. There might have been too much expended, but it had all gone to a public purpose sanctioned, or that he believed would be sanctioned, by this House. The whole of the money had gone to this public object, and he would point out that it was not charged that there was extravagance either in the site or the building. The charge had been made that the expenditure was illegal, but this he denied. The hon. member did not impeach the Minister of Education. The charge simply amounted to this:—That the buildings cost more than was originally contemplated, but there was nothing to impeach in that. The general notion, no doubt, was that the sum voted would be sufficient. It had to be borne in mind that this was not an object that was not sanctioned, that was not known to the House, but only a case where the sum asked for was insufficient. The important question was if the expenditure was legal or not, but he thought it was clear enough, as it was not made specific the amounts that should be expended on equipment. The \$50,000 mentioned by the hon. member had accumulated since the statute and could be devoted to the purpose for which it was taken. He was not claiming that the action was regular, but he be-