

the annual per capita cost in ten New York asylums, we find in 1898 the amount expended was \$185.20 per capita, as against \$124 in the Province of Ontario. In six Massachusetts asylums the average was \$175.24; in five Pennsylvania asylums the average was \$185.61. Then with regard to the Central Prison a few words might properly be said. That institution is maintained at considerable expense to the country, and while it is impossible to say whether this or that item is excessive or otherwise, by a comparison with similar institutions elsewhere we can assure ourselves, approximately at all events, that reasonable economy is practised. In 1899 there was an average of 388 persons in the Central Prison, costing \$616.34 gross, or \$114.95 net. The Kingston Penitentiary, with a population of 615, cost \$203.59 net, or \$318.21 gross; showing that as compared with Kingston, where the conditions would warrant us in assuming that with larger population the per capita expense would be less, we are managing the Central Prison for nearly \$90 less per capita than the Kingston Penitentiary is managed.

After comparing the cost of maintaining prisoners at the Central Prison with similar institutions in the other Provinces and in the United States, Mr. Ross continued:—Take the cost in Scotland, where economical habits are associated with every public and private duty. The cost at Peterhead, Scotland, with a population of 350, was \$172.72. In Perth, Scotland, the cost per capita was \$212.57, and in twelve local prisons in Scotland with an average population of 157 the cost was \$359.73, or three times the expenditure in the Province of Ontario.

A School, Not a Prison.

Then, if we take our own reformatory for boys at Penetanguishene, we find by comparison similar results. This institution has been severely criticized by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Matheson). I think he has found that the cost per capita now is more than it was twenty or thirty years ago. I think that cost is justifiable. When that institution was first opened it was purely a reformatory, rather a jail, perhaps, a house of correction, a place of confinement; very little money was spent in the education of the boys, or instruction in handicraft; so far as their education merely was concerned very little money was expended upon them. We have turned it into an industrial school, practically; we employ a larger staff than ever before for the instruction of the boys, and every effort is made to educate them, so that when their terms expire they will be honest and useful citizens. The cost last year for 133 boys was \$218.44 per capita. The hon. gentlemen will see that this is nearly one hundred dollars more than the Central Prison, for the reason that it is not a prison and should not be a prison, but an industrial school. In Massachusetts Reformatory for Boys the cost was \$240.53; in Wisconsin, \$302.36; in Minnesota, \$355.23, and in Pennsylvania, \$342.71. I need not give all the figures; we have

covered a large area. In this statement the attempt has been made to ascertain over a large area what the average cost of similar institutions is, and the figures I have given will enable hon. gentlemen to understand our position relatively to the position of similar institutions abroad.

Then, the Mercer Reformatory, with a population of 106, cost \$214.16 per capita; the Reformatory for Women in Massachusetts cost \$215.43 per head, and the Industrial Home in Michigan \$323.16 per head.

Mr. Ross then reviewed the management of the asylum farms, showing that they, besides giving healthy employment to the inmates, afforded profit and reduced the expenses.

Expenditure for 1900.

I propose now to deal with the questions of expenditure for the year 1900. Hon. gentlemen will observe that there is a slight increase in some of the items of the estimates, as compared with the estimates of the previous year. Under the heading "Civil Government" we expended last year \$253,073.03. This year the estimated expenditure is \$263,440. The increase there was made up by small items, such as increase in public salaries and other items which we will have before us in detail when the estimates are reached by the House. Under the head of "Legislation" it is also proposed to increase the estimate as compared with last year. I have acted upon this principle in regard to the estimates of the current year, namely, the increases are where the expenditure of the previous year showed that we had not taken enough money for ordinary purpose. As hon. gentlemen who have examined into the public accounts will notice that in the administration there was an overdraft—considerable in some cases—in order to avoid that in future we have increased the estimate. That will account partly for the increased estimate for legislation this year. Last year the estimate was \$105,200; this year it is \$133,200. Last year the sum was far from being sufficient. We have, therefore, increased it, in order that the estimate might approach more closely the requisite expenditure. However, I have anticipated what I want to say in regard to it. "Administration of Justice"—the estimate under this heading is \$448,649, being an increase over the estimate of last year of \$6,000. In education there has been an increase of from \$734,862 to \$750,048.

Education.

A word or two in regard to that increase of expenditure in education. Hon. gentlemen will see that we have increased the grant for continuation classes. Then we have on our hands now a Normal School at London, which will add to the expenditure about \$10,000. Then, owing to the increase of our public schools, we must increase from time to time the expenditure for inspection. The expenditure last year for that was insufficient. We also propose to increase the cost of the inspection of separate schools, for which we are asking about a thousand dollars additional, in the hope that before the year expires we will be able to make more generous provision for that branch of the public service. For in-