

tionate to the wants of the Provincial Institutions, for directing and for practically carrying out the higher branches of Education. The principal points insisted on are the Buildings, the Library and Museum, the Professorial Staff, Examinations, and Scholarships. These I will reply to separately; but before doing so, I must be allowed to allude to an implied charge against myself. Dr. Ryerson, in his evidence before the Committee, merely alluded in passing to the salaried Vice-Chancellor, who audited the expenditure which he had himself authorised; but in the printed document put forth by the Conference in support of their memorial, intended to produce its effect in another sphere, the same point is more frequently insisted upon, and it is stated that some undue influence has been exerted to prevent the publication of the Accounts. As Provincial Auditor, it is certainly my duty to see that the Bursar makes no improper use of the public moneys, and produces vouchers for all his expenditure, and his accounts are accordingly examined in my office as all others are; but as Auditor, I have no more power to interfere with the objects of the expenditure, than I have with Dr. Ryerson's distribution of the grants placed under his superintendence. As to the publication of the Accounts, the Bursar is required by law to lay them annually before Parliament; and whether they are printed or not rests with the Printing Committee, and not with me.

Before going into details I must also explain a point, which the public would never gather from the evidence of the gentlemen at whose instance this investigation is made, viz: that the endowment, consisting of lands in various parts of the Province, requires an extensive establishment to manage it, and is, in fact, a department of the Government, over which the University authorities have no control. Whether its arrangements may not be economised, is a question which the Committee may ascertain from the evidence of the Bursar; but as far as the University authorities are concerned, it is the net revenue only which they have to deal with, and this is all which at present is available for academical education. The revenue in the preceding evidence is spoken of as \$60,000 or \$70,000; and by adding to it that of Upper Canada College, it is set down by Dr. Ryerson as \$80,000; but the highest amount which the net revenue ever reached was \$56,000, in 1856, when the run after land was at the highest, and the average net revenue since 1853, has only been \$48,000.* It will be for the Committee to decide, whether this amount is so much more than a Provincial University can require, as it has been argued, and whether it is sufficient to be divided amongst the numerous claimants, without destroying the object for which it was set apart.

* How much of this amount would be left for the University, if even the present demand of the denominational claimants were satisfied, may be judged from their evidence. Mr. Nelles (Q. 407) says he wants £2500 more than his present income, (leaving it doubtful whether this is in addition to what he already receives in the estimates.) If Queen's, Trinity, and Regiopolis, received as much, supposing there to be no other claimants, the whole fund would be exhausted, and whence are the University and University College to derive their income? Dr. Ryerson contemplates with satisfaction ten separate Colleges with £1500 each, requiring \$60,000, without any provision for the University. Dr. Cook (Q. 18 and 44) proposes £6500 for the University and College, including Scholarships, of which £1250 is to be for the University. He also proposes that the Denominational Colleges shall each receive one-half of what is allowed to University College. To accomplish this would require an income of \$70,000; but it is idle to suppose that the four existing Colleges would be the only claimants.