

hospitals were purely local, and had no more right to Provincial support than others maintained purely on local aid. He would not, however, be understood to throw anything in the way of restricting the usefulness of these hospitals. He would be inclined to support those hospitals in schedule A, but was not in favour of aiding the others.

Mr. MEREDITH said that the hon. member forgot that the paupers and young incorrigibles flocked to the cities. He thought that the Government should proceed further in the way of aiding hospitals for bringing up the class that would otherwise be a burden to the community upon which it would prey. The miserable pittance of two cents per day to each inmate should not be grudged. The agricultural community should remember that it gets this aid sent out to it, and that it sends in its poor to the cities. The country had little to complain of.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE questioned if the proportion of paupers was larger in the city than in the country. Some one had suggested to have poor houses over the country, but he detested the name. They had not a house of industry east of Kingston until they came to Ottawa, and in this house the poor from all around were taken in. Were they to let the poor die on the road-side when, if they had any Christianity about them, they believed that the life of one of these was worth more than all the expenditure. If the counties provided houses of refuge for themselves, then the cities would pay for their poor themselves.

Mr. GIBSON said that had the two hon. gentlemen preceding him been right in their premises their arguments would have been right. The report showed that over nine thousand were from the cities, and only four hundred from the country.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said that he knew for a fact that patients applying for admission misrepresented where they came from in the hope of procuring admission.

Mr. LAUDER deprecated all remarks detracting from the usefulness of such institutions as the Toronto General Hospital. It was a valuable school for medical practitioners.

Mr. HARGRAFT said that from the manner in which hon. members spoke this House paid for all the support of the Toronto Hospital, when they only paid \$9,000 and the outside public gave \$100,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR said the Toronto Hospital was the only one he cared much for. It was Provincial in character, and he knew that people from his own county had been benefited by it.

Mr. RICHARDSON said that the Government should give encouragement to those counties desirous of establishing county poor houses. It was their experience that this plan is cheaper than individual relief. He hoped the Government would not deal niggardly with these grants.

Mr. CAMERON said that his remarks had been quite misunderstood. The position which he took was this—that as they were paying only \$43,000 for hospitals and \$359,876 for asylums the proportion was wrong, and the hospitals were entitled to more consideration. Only 445 patients had been admitted to the asylums, and 10,331 were admitted to hospitals, and that surely could not be considered an assault upon the Treasury. It was disgraceful to their humanity that this sectional feeling was displayed. It mattered nothing whence a man came; if he needed aid he should get it. He reiterated that the cost of asylums and hospitals was out of all proportion. The sick were quite as entitled to aid as the mentally sick. And how were their medical men to get their training if not in these hospitals? And where could the hospitals be better located than in cities where medical men of the highest distinction gave their services gratis. Charity was too extended in its significance to be located by the distinction of town from country; hon. gentlemen gave a dollar, not because the sickness came from the country or the town, but because it was sickness, and it was desirable to relieve it.

His previous remarks were entirely in reference to the hospitals.

After a few further remarks from Mr. BARR, the item was passed.

On the item of miscellaneous expenditure, \$55,447,

Mr. MEREDITH asked on what authority \$1,000 had been paid by the Government for pamphlets for the Australian Exhibition?

Mr. WOOD explained that a deputation from the Ontario Manufacturers' Association had waited on the Government with reference to the advisability of having a pamphlet written to advertise the Province at the Sydney Exhibition. The Ottawa Government had offered to send the goods of exhibitors free, and 116 persons availed themselves of this offer, 106 being from Ontario and only ten from Quebec. It was agreed between the Government and the Manufacturers' Association that each should pay half the expense of the pamphlet which was to cost \$2,000. When the pamphlet was completed, it was found to be most unsatisfactory to the Government, the information concerning the wealth resources, and population of the Province not being such as they expected. But in order to do justice to the printer's and paper-makers who undertook the work of preparing the pamphlet in the belief that they were doing it for the Government they had paid what was agreed upon with the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. SCOTT contended that at the last session the Treasurer had promised that this amount should not be paid. Besides, it was paid out of a fund that it should not have been paid from.

Mr. CROOKS explained that the pamphlet which some person had assumed to write was not such as in any sense to fulfil the requirements of the Government, and it was only when the Government found that the agreement made with the printers and paper-makers would justify them in relieving these persons, that the judgment was made.

Mr. MEREDITH contended that the Manufacturers' Association had agreed, in consideration of this money, to bring out a pamphlet which would be satisfactory to the Government. They had failed to do so, and he did not see what claim they had upon the Government.

Mr. CROOKS said that when the promise of the \$1,000 was made, the understanding was very much different from what it turned out to be afterwards regarded. Under the circumstances, the Government could not, to do fairly, have done otherwise than they did.

Mr. LAUDER alleged that the payment of this money was made without the consent of Parliament, and he thought the House should have the opportunity of saying whether they approved of it or not.

The item was then passed

On the item of \$55,447 for miscellaneous

Mr. MEREDITH called attention to the item of allowances to counties under 30 Vic. cap. 31, and said that these grants according to the Statute could only be made on an order in Council ratified by the House.

Mr. WOOD thought there was no doubt that the grants could be made by the House.

Mr. PARDEE said the Order in Council might be submitted after the vote was made.

Mr. MEREDITH contended that the Order in Council must first be submitted.

Mr. FRASER said the provision in the statute was merely formal, and was more for the protection of the House than anything else.

It being six o'clock the Committee rose.

RETURNS.

Mr. HARDY presented the annual report of University College for 1877, and a return containing papers relating to the appointment of a Commission to enquire into the abstraction of ballot papers in connection with the Lincoln Election trial.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) complained that the members were not furnished with copies of reprinted Acts.

Mr. FRASER said that was a matter which was not under the control of the Govern-