

lieved it to be legal. The case as presented by the hon. member was enormously exaggerated. The whole transaction was carried on in good faith and he did not see any reason why the House should not vote down the resolution proposed by the hon. member. (Applause.)

Mr. Wood (Hastings) said the whole question a few years ago as to whether the college would be continued or not was, what would the college cost? It was understood that the cost would not exceed \$200,000. The Minister used a larger sum than he was authorised. He charged that the extra expenditure was a breach of faith with the House. No bolstering up will alter the facts that the contract made by the House was violated. The sum authorised to be spent was exceeded by \$160,000. There can be no answer to the charge. Where was this sort of thing to end?

#### MR. ROSS' SPEECH.

Mr. Ross said that he had frequently been charged unfairly and unreasonably, but he supposed it had reached the height when to-night his conduct was impeached, and he was charged with malversation of public funds—of taking funds from the public treasury. He thought, however, that the charges so vehemently made should have been followed up by something more substantial than had been brought to light. He denied the charge that the expenditure was illegal and without the authority of the House. He was content to rest his claim as to this on the authority of the Attorney-General, and he was sure the opinion of the Attorney-General would be acceptable not only to the House but to the country, and would carry much more weight with it than the opinion of the hon. member for London. To explain this question it would be necessary to go back to 1887 and 1888. In 1887 the Government had a great trust that it was thought should be divided between Upper Canada College and the university. There was the site on King street appraised at \$325,000, and the endowment of Upper Canada College amounting to \$280,000. It was thought that rather than obliterate Upper Canada College the trust might be divided between the university and the college. It was provided by the act of 1887 that the lands on King street might be sold, and that from the proceeds the new college might be erected, while the endowment of the college should go to the university. It then stood thus—that there were two funds, one in land and the other in money. The land was to go to restore Upper Canada College; the money was to go to the university. In 1888, however, owing to the increase in the value of land through the boom then going on, it was thought better not to sell the land just then. It was decided that the land should be transferred to the university, and it was also provided that all the property heretofore vested in the Crown for Upper Canada College—land, securities and all—should be vested for the two educational interests. The charges against the fund were, first, the site of the new college, then the buildings and the equipment. In 1888, then, the position was that everything went to the university after the purchase of the site and the erection and equipping of the building. With regard to the cost of the site, the increase to \$35,000 instead of \$20,000, as originally proposed, an order in Council was passed and ratified, and the hon. members had approved of it. The site was worth much more to-day than it was when purchased, and he would venture to say that within the next ten years its value would be immensely increased. If in years to come the boys now attending that college should occupy seats in this House he was confident they would unanimously approve of the extra expenditure that secured to the college so admirable a location.

Then as to the amount expended on the building. The amount authorised for this purpose was \$120,000 and this had not been exceeded. The contract to Mr. Herbert was not \$137,000 as stated by the hon. member, but was originally within the \$120,000 appropriation. The extra sum expended was in

this way: The trustees by their ability and economy—and he could not speak too highly of their earnestness and devotion to the interests of the college—had saved \$40,000, and this sum spent on the buildings brought the expenditure under that head up to \$160,000. The only question then was, had they the right to appropriate this \$40,000 for the purpose of erecting buildings? and he believed he could answer safely that they had. By section 18 of the act the Lieutenant-Governor in Council was authorised to add this to the permanent fund of the college, or otherwise apply it as might be deemed expedient. After considering the wants of the college, and the necessity for increased accommodation for the pupils, it was deemed expedient to apply this surplus to the enlargement of the buildings.

#### THE EXPENDITURE LEGAL.

The expenditure was therefore strictly within the act. When we came to pay for the expenditure on buildings we found, as expected, that this surplus income would be required, and we were about to apply that extra sum. The university trustees were anxious that the lands should not be encumbered, as there was some likelihood of sales being made, and the order in Council was delayed in order to see if the negotiations would be fruitful or otherwise. The money was advanced, not to meet an emergency of the college but of the university, and this was considered reasonable, as the Government were trustees for both. It was a trifling irregularity to meet a special case, and it was corrected at the earliest possible moment, having regard to the interests of both the college and the university. It was a responsibility that any Government would have to take upon itself at times and throw itself upon the good sense of the House and even of its opponents. The irregularity had been corrected and an order in Council made, and he desired to point out that no objection had been raised as to the right to use the surplus income in that way. If surplus income were added to capital account, as the hon. member considered should be done, how would he regulate a case where a deficit had occurred one year? They would then be compelled to draw upon the permanent fund to meet such cases.

#### THE EQUIPMENT.

Taking up the expenditure for equipment, Mr. Ross showed clearly that the expenditure was clearly within the law. The reading of the act showed that while the Government was limited with regard to expenditure for structural purposes, equipment was not included in the \$120,000. He instanced an item of \$1,900 for the gymnasium which he had resisted for some time as an evidence that the Government was most punctilious to keep within the provisions of the law. From a reading of the act, the merest tyro would see that it was not intended that the expenditure for equipment should be included in the sums mentioned. He proceeded to show that the expenditure on equipment was not excessive. It was true that \$88,000 was a large sum, but it had to be borne in mind that it was a large building, requiring the best possible fire protection, ventilation, sanitary arrangements and so on. The sanitation was now so good that the visits from the medical profession were one-quarter less than they had been in the old building. Then there was no expenditure in fine carving or garrishment, such as could be seen in many of the colleges of the old land, but the expenditure had been on the ordinary requirements to place the college in a thoroughly satisfactory condition. There had been honest expenditure, and there had been no malversation of public funds. They had only done what any Government or business concern would have done, and what the country expected them to do. They had placed the college in such a position that for the next 50 years it would, owing to its admirable site and its