

Mr. MEREDITH said there had been a mistake in regard to the London Asylum last year, in consequence of an amount of \$1,937 received by it from the city of London having been omitted, which had made a considerable difference in the amount granted. He thought institutions which had been founded since the passage of the Act ought to obtain the benefit of its provisions. He also considered that the rate per day for institutions under class C should be increased.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) referred to the large quantity of wine which was used in some of the institutions.

Mr. LAUDER urged that a strict supervision should be exercised by the Inspector over the reports made to him by the various institutions, since the grant was supposed to be given proportionately to the work done. He referred to the various Roman Catholic charitable institutions throughout the Province, pointing out that largely increased grants were being made to them since the new Act had come into operation. He found that eleven such institutions throughout the Province under the old system had been receiving an aggregate of \$6,080, whereas they were asked to give the same institutions this year a total of \$13,028. He found, too, that the Houses of Industry, Orphans' Homes, Houses of Providence, and others not under denominational control had on the contrary very largely fallen off in the amount of the grants given to them. He didn't wish to be uncharitable, but he desired the Committee to notice the operations of the Act. He would like to know what data had been furnished to the Inspector in order to arrive at the division of the money. Some of the institutions had received supplementary grants last year, but he did not think it advisable to continue to override the Act of Parliament. He hoped all these charities would be treated alike.

Mr. FRASER desired to know whether the hon. member for East Grey represented the Opposition.

Mr. LAUDER—I do not.

Mr. FRASER said that it was evident from the figures given that the object of the Government had been in a large measure carried out, by additional aid being given to charitable institutions. The hon. member took the same ground last year as the present session, only more broadly. All of the eleven institutions quoted, except two, were Catholic, and they were selected to show that Catholic institutions were receiving more aid than should be given to them. The whole object and intent of the hon. member's speech was to draw such a comparison between the aid given to the Catholic and Protestant institutions as would bring the Government into disrepute. The eleven institutions referred to received \$13,000 out of \$57,000, a little less than one-fourth, which was a fair proportion. Not only had the hon. member made a bigoted address, but he had questioned the correctness and honesty of the returns of the institutions. Last year he had, indeed, charged the Government with being led by Catholic influence, but he had not dared to repeat that charge distinctly that evening lest he should offend some of the Catholic members on the Opposition side of the House. The policy of the Government was to grant the money of the Province, which was contributed by Protestants and Catholics alike, to the charitable institutions on the basis of the amount of work done. It should be remembered, moreover, that a number of the Protestant institutions only received those who belonged to the Protestant religion.

Mr. LAUDER—What are they?

Mr. FRASER quoted the cases of a Protestant institution at Ottawa and the Toronto Orphans' Home, and trusted that the House would not be misled by the unfair and bigoted appeal made by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. SINCLAIR thought that Mr. Sandfield Macdonald committed a grave error when, after he had introduced his measure to abolish denominational grants to colleges, he did not advance further, and do away altogether with denominational grants. No member of that Legislature should be known by the religious opinions he held, and no questions affecting religious denominations should be brought before the House; indeed, sooner or later that state of things would be brought about. So long as the Legislature gave grants to denominational charities, whether Protestant or Catholic, insinuations would be made that excessive grants had been made to certain denomina-

tions in order to obtain political support. It might occur in future years that religious denominations might press the Government to increase grants, and the question might thereby become a source of corruption to the country. The grants were rapidly increasing, and the Legislature should reconsider its policy with regard to them, and instead of aiding denominational charities, the Government should have its own charities and aid them, leaving the denominations to support their own institutions.

Mr. CROOKS said the hon. member for North Bruce had entirely mistaken the scope of the Act under which the grants were made, which was merely to carry out the general policy of the Government, viz., to help those who helped themselves. The intention was not to strengthen denominational institutions, but solely for the purpose of aiding charitable institutions upon the broad basis of charity, which ought to know no denomination. The hon. member was incorrect in assuming to place those charitable institutions on a similar footing with educational institutions. The latter had their origin in denominational necessities, while the charitable institutions had their origin, purely and simply, in that general feeling of charity which ought to characterize every religious denomination. The effect of the Act had been quite satisfactory; the amount contributed by the general public had been largely increased. The Inspector in his report stated that during the past year \$60,051 was received in aid of hospitals, or an increase of \$25,061 over the previous year, and upwards of \$40,000 over the receipts of 1873, when the old system of granting Government aid to hospitals existed. The Inspector further stated that no less than \$58,758 was received for the ordinary maintenance of asylums from other than Government sources, of which sum the Government grants only bore a proportion of ten per cent. to the entire amount expended in their support and maintenance. The object of the Act had been accomplished, and the question of grants had been removed from the Legislature, where the amounts voted might depend largely upon the pressure and importunity of the denominational bodies.

In answer to Mr. Meredith,

Mr. CROOKS said it was not intended to confine the Act to the institutions mentioned in the schedule, though it required an application, an inspection, the assent of the Government, and the sanction of the House. It was desired to make the Act as broad as possible.

Mr. ROBINSON asked how it was the House of Providence in Toronto received \$11,000, while the House of Providence in Kingston received nothing at all.

Mr. CROOKS said the matter had not been brought under the attention of the Government.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said he believed the Government intended to make this Act apply to both Protestant and Catholic institutions according to the amount of good they did. Children cared for in orphan asylums were saved from the Reformatory and the Penitentiary. The member for East Grey had insinuated that the returns from the Catholic institutions were not correct. He might have easily satisfied himself before making his statement. The hon. gentleman's statement was a very narrow and prejudiced one, though it consisted of insinuations. The hon. gentleman was like a will o'-the-wisp, now you have him and now you don't. He regretted that hon. gentlemen opposite constantly threw the question of sectarianism in the teeth of the small minority of Catholics in this House.

Mr. LAUDER denied that he had any intention to introduce religious strife. He thought the action of the Commissioner of Public Works deserved severer criticism than it had yet received.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he regretted to find the tendency of the debates to be often the reverse of edifying. The only institutions of this kind of which he had ever been a working member were Protestant institutions. He was not bigoted, but the member for East Grey had conveyed to his mind something like an insinuation in his remarks. (Cheers.) He was satisfied that the principle on which this charity was dispensed, namely, helping those who helped themselves, was a good one. (Hear, hear.) If the Government were guilty of no greater wrong than this, he could see no occasion to find