

(a) He computes the grant of \$1,000,000 made some years ago to be the equivalent of \$50,000 a year.

(b) The grant which has been made for some years of \$25,000:

(c) The grant of \$25,000 to the Agricultural School:

(d) The grant of \$7,000 with reference to the School of Commerce.

Now as to (a), Mr. Taschereau cannot have it both ways but he can have it either way he likes. If he chooses to say that his grant is \$50,000 a year I hope we shall hear no more about the grant of \$1,000,000. If he prefers to regard it as a grant of \$1,000,000 he cannot say that he is giving us \$50,000 a year as well, because he has not given us \$1,000,000 and \$50,000 a year, but \$1,000,000 or \$50,000 a year. If I gave \$200. a year to the Federated Charities it is unfair for me to reason that as that \$200. if put at 5% interest produces \$10. a year I would be entitled in the second year in giving \$200. to remit only \$190., saying that the other \$10. was made up by the interest on my first donation. I therefore consider that the \$50,000 mentioned in (a) should not be taken into account.

(c) The grant of \$25,000 to the Agricultural School must be spent in a certain way. It is not given to us in order that we may do what we please with it and in that way should not be looked upon as a contribution to the funds of the University. The \$7,000 mentioned in (d) is simply to offset the gift which the Government made to Roman Catholic education when they established the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciale.

Again I am told that some mention