

return) of the Professor of Meteorology is to be charged to the Observatory Grant. The salary of the Professor of Agriculture was reduced to \$400 per annum. The Professorship of Modern Languages was abolished. The appointment of two lecturers in French and German is authorized." All these changes are in the direction of reforms advocated by Dr. Cook, then Principal of Queen's College, before the Parliamentary Committee of 1860. The University and College, together with the Bursar's office, are now limited to an appropriation out of the General Income Fund of \$45,000, exclusive of fees. During the year ending June 30th, 1867, when the new system had fairly come into operation, they exceeded this appropriation by over \$1,500, and doubtless two or three years will elapse before they can reconcile themselves to the new order of affairs, for the spendthrift cannot easily accommodate extravagant habits to shrunken commons. But from what source is this deficiency of \$1,500 to be made up? We are not informed. The return merely states that "directions are given for the guidance of the Bursar in case of a deficiency of available income to meet the expenditure of any year." The Return for Upper Canada College is more explicit on this point. That smaller Institution had followed the example of extravagance set by the larger institution, as the small boat follows in the wake of the ship. Hence it also had to be set on an allowance; and if this allowance is exceeded in any year, "pro rata deductions from the salaries are to be made." Is this to be the *modus operandi* for meeting an adverse balance in the accounts of the University and University College? Perhaps a delicate consideration for the reduced circumstances of those who once lorded it haughtily dictated the omission from the return of the larger institutions, or it may not have been inserted for the same reason that, while you snub a little boy, you must say naught to a big boy for a like offence. Before passing from the subject of annual deficiencies of revenue, we may express our curiosity to know how the authorities at Toronto propose to deal with the aggregate of balances against income amounting to over \$70,000 already referred to. Will they take these (say nothing of interest accruing on them since they arose during successive years) out of the Permanent Fund, and thereby curtail the Income Fund in all time coming to the extent of \$4,200 per

annum? Or will they gradually liquidate these past balances out of the savings that may annually be realized from the difference between the Full Income Fund and the appropriation of \$45,000. This they cannot do *legally*, as such savings, by Clause 54 of the Act, go to form the Surplus Income Fund. But, nevertheless, (for why talk of law to persons that have put themselves above all law?) they appear to have devoted to this very purpose the surplus of \$4,430 that thus accrued during 1867—thereby reducing the debt from \$70,215 to \$65,785.

The expenses connected with the Bursar's office, which managed the finances of the University, University College, and Upper Canada College, from January, 1861, to June, 1866, a period of five and a half years, amounted to \$44,586. of this sum \$9,869 were borne by the Upper Canada College, leaving \$34,717, being an average of \$6,312 per annum, as the proportion chargeable to the University and College. By one of the recent orders in Council, already referred to, these expenses have been limited to \$4,000, of which Upper Canada College shall bear one-fourth, and the University Fund three-fourths, i.e. \$3,000 per annum, less than one-half of what was formerly expended. The question arises, is this sum sufficient? Can the office be efficiently managed on this amount? Let us turn for an answer to the accounts for the year, ending June, 1867. What do we find the charges of the Bursar's office to have been for that year? \$3,978, of which Upper Canada College was charged with \$994, and \$2,984 assigned as the quota to be borne by the University and College: thus demonstrating that the appropriation made by the Order in Council was amply sufficient for all necessary purposes; and thus a saving of not less than \$3,300 a year has been effected in this one department, without impairing the efficiency of the management. Had that order been passed thirteen years previously, the Endowment in this one item of expense, would have been richer by over \$50,000, a sum, the interest on which would suffice to meet all the expenses of the office at the rate now fixed.

Our readers are already aware that \$360,000 were expended in the erection of a costly pile of buildings, an expenditure both unnecessary and illegal. Unnecessary because the University and College already had a substantial structure erected especially for their use a few years previously, at