

splendid sanitary equipment, etc., attract students from far and near, and in this way be self-sustaining. He believed that as a result of that expenditure Upper Canada College was in a more favorable position than it had ever been since its establishment. It had a fine site, a fine building, and was well equipped. As a result of the increased accommodation they were able to increase the fees of the students. Heretofore the college was a charge upon its endowment of from \$5,000 to \$15,000 per annum. This year and hereafter he was confident it would be carried on within its own natural income, and that was the position they had been enabled to place the college in. (Applause.) If they had put up a cheap building, with poor sanitation and general equipment, it would probably be a continual drain upon endowment. Because of the progressive spirit of the trustees and those in charge—because of the public policy of those concerned—they had placed the college on a sound footing. It occupied that position to-day, and was probably the only self-sustaining college in the country. (Applause.)

#### COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.

Mr. Ross then quoted figures showing that in the United States they had been far more liberal in expenditure for their colleges, and that the decorations in the college were much more unassuming than in other colleges, and even more moderate than in many high schools. He then took up the relations between the university and Upper Canada College, and the charge that the university was being despoiled for the benefit of the college. By the act of 1887 the university was to get \$275,000, but with the increase now of the value of the site on King street the university would, he believed, in 1892 get \$380,000 from that property instead of \$275,000 as originally proposed. With reference to the charge or insinuation that too much was being expended on the college to the detriment of the university, he showed that the college gave up \$500,000 for \$150,000 and a revenue of \$250,000 for an endowment of \$100,000. Both these institutions, he said, were the wards of the State and should be treated fairly in any division. They would be untrue to their trust if they neglected the college even for the benefit of the university.

#### THE OVERDRAWN ACCOUNT.

Then with regard to the charges that the bank account was overdrawn, he pointed out that the account was temporarily overdrawn for the benefit of the university. Instead of converting securities into cash, an open account was kept in the Bank of Commerce, it being considered more economical to pay interest on an open account than to convert securities that yielded a larger interest into cash. Mr. Walker, the manager of the Bank of Commerce, was one of the trustees, and would see that there was no irregularity. The interest was regularly met from the revenues of the college, and in a short time the accounts would be straightened up and closed, and Upper Canada College would get her endowment. This could not be done at once, but next year the balance account would show what had been paid in interest and on capital account. It was not an unusual thing that an account should be temporarily overdrawn, and this was done by every concern at one time or another. The Government and the country was solvent, and there was no question but that the amount would be repaid and the accounts closed up in a proper and legitimate manner.

He had hoped the hon. gentleman opposite would have dealt with this subject in a different tone. In 1887, when the continuance of the college was threatened, the question was settled, and he had thought that the settlement was final. He would ask, was it wise or judicious at this day to make an attack upon the college, as indicated in the course pursued by the hon. members? The college had only been dealt with in a spirit

of fair and decent liberality. The attack was groundless unless it was proved that there was malversation. It did not lie within the right of hon. gentlemen opposite to make charges of malversation. The charges savored of the charges that had been made at Ottawa against the hon. gentleman's friends, and should not be lightly made unless there was something more tangible than had been shown by the hon. member. If the unexpected increase of expenditure and the delays were in the interests of the trust, then every member of the House who believed in the Province doing its duty to any trust committed to its care would be called upon to vindicate the action of the Government. He was glad to be able to say on behalf of both the university and the college that the Government had done its duty towards both trusts, and he was sure no one would blame the Government for giving a moderate share of the amount to which they were entitled for fully establishing, strengthening and perpetuating Upper Canada College. (Applause.)

Mr. Whitney followed, and explained his position with regard to the college to be that there was no reason for the cry against the college made in 1887. He, however, did not believe in it being maintained to so large an extent by public funds. The question was whether or not the money appropriated by the statute of 1887 covered the expenditure made by the Minister. He read the statute and declared that the money expended exceeded the appropriation made by the Legislature.

Mr. Tait said he admired the modesty of the last speaker, who referred to what he called "feeble arguments" of the Attorney-General. It was absurd for that member, or anyone else on his side of the House, to attempt to controvert the expressly-made legal opinion of the Attorney-General. He ridiculed the interpretation put on the statute of 1887 by Mr. Whitney. The exaggerated statements of Mr. Meredith reminded him of the man who was running for Congress, and who being asked why he spoke so loudly, replied:—"When I have facts I give them. When I have arguments I use them. When I have neither facts nor arguments I yell and saw the air." (Great laughter.) Regarding the expenditure, he said that if the university did not complain there was no reason for the motion. He said it was absurd to say that after \$77,916 was spent on equipment the balance out of \$120,000 which was laid aside for the buildings should be handed over. The question was not the continuance of the college. That was settled. The question was the manner in which the money had been spent, and he was quite prepared to support the action of the Government. The Government had found that the buildings would cost a little more than they at first thought. What business man was there who did not have a similar experience?

Mr. Marter moved the adjournment of the debate. This gave Mr. Meredith an opportunity of replying to the remarks of the Minister of Education. He said there was no order in Council authorising the purchase of the present site. He said that a fund of \$275,000 was laid aside for the college and the Minister took \$315,000 for the buildings and site and an additional \$100,000 for a permanent fund, or \$415,000 in all. The Minister had no right to take any of the money set aside for the university. He ventured to say the university could compel the Province to refund the money taken from it.

Mr. Balfour said he never had any sympathy with Upper Canada College and thought it might be done away with. He, however, did not agree with the amendment made by Mr. Meredith. That amendment says the expenditure was illegal. Now the Attorney-General in his official capacity gave his deliberate opinion that the expenditure was not illegal. He therefore could not vote for the amendment.

Dr. McMahon said that Mr. Harcourt in 1887 was opposed to the maintenance of the college, but circumstances had changed