

poor, and thus do something towards preventing the spread of the disease and lessen the distress and poverty for which he is now spending so much money every year.

WHY THE PHILANTHROPIC AND CHARITABLE SHOULD CONTRIBUTE.

There is no disease that so strongly appeals to one's sympathy and charity as tuberculosis among the poor, especially when we see the breadwinner stricken down, and the life ebbing away in crowded, unsanitary, and ill-ventilated dwellings, with nothing in the surroundings to give half a chance for life, and everything to facilitate the spread of the germs of disease to others in whom the poverty and surroundings have helped to produce the nidus for the rapid development of the disease.

I am sure that when a clear, well-defined and workable plan is presented wherein the the three other mentioned sources would co-operate, a liberal response would be forthcoming from the charitably-disposed in contributions, donations, legacies, and bequests. No greater inducement could be given, and no more potent argument could be advanced than the willingness of the Dominion Parliament, Provincial Legislatures, and municipalities to co-operate in this important work.

Some may object to the plan because they think it is new, and has never been tried in any part of the world. This may be true, and if it is true, I see no reason why a young, vigorous nation like this Canada of ours should not have something new. Name it if you like the "Canadian Rational Plan" for dealing with the consumptive poor, and I care not whether you call it old or new so long as it accomplishes the end in view. However, whether the plan is new or not, the co-operative principle that underlies it is not new. It is now being applied in a somewhat modified form in our public schools, technical schools, and houses of refuge for the poor; and to illustrate the effect of grants by the Government and qualified ratepayers upon the charitably-disposed, I refer you to what has taken place in the county of Ontario during the present month. John Cowan, and his brother, W. F. Cowan, of Oshawa, offered grants, the former \$5,000 in cash, and the latter forty-five acres of land, provided that a by-law for \$12,000 is approved of by the qualified ratepayers of the county. To secure this and also the Government grant of \$4,000, a by-law was submitted for the above amount on August 21st, and carried by a large majority. This makes, I am told, the twentieth county in this province where such Houses of Refuge have been established.

Now I maintain that every argument that can be used in support of such Houses of Refuge for the poor can with greater force be used in support of the co-operative plan proposed in this proposition for the establishment of rural sanatoria for the consumptive poor. In other words, if the poor who are well require a House of Refuge how much more do the poor who are ill with tuberculosis need a rural sanatorium?