

before taking any steps or incurring any expense. After having received further light on the subject from the discussion, I am quite willing that the word "shall" should be changed to "may."

Dr. THORNBURN—I think this committee is a very important one. The expenses in connection with prosecutions are something alarming, and one sometimes asks, is it worth the shot? Isn't it waste of money? Perhaps it is to our advantage that quacks should go on and treat the public. We are doing this work of prosecution as much for the public as for ourselves. Another point I wish to mention is, I think a small committee is a more effectual one than a large one. Where there are quite a number of men on a committee they reason with themselves in this way, "I cannot go, but there are plenty of other fellows there;" while if you name a smaller committee, each man feels that the thing cannot go on without him. So far as remuneration is concerned, while I am as fond of money as most men can be, if it is thought desirable I shall be happy if you choose to put my name on and keep it on to give my services gratuitously. But I do not see why we should as a committee be different from other committees altogether. There is a good deal of work in this thing, and a good deal of bad feeling is oftentimes created, and I would like if possible that the Discipline Committee should undertake this duty, but I see difficulties in the way. Calling them to Toronto from different parts of the Province would be attended with a very great deal of expense. I think the committee proposed would be of very great advantage to the Council.

Dr. McLAUGHLIN—There is no doubt the enforcement of any law that is calculated to punish scamps is envired with a great many difficulties; and even if you appoint this committee I have not the slightest idea you are going to overcome these difficulties. In my judgment a good, sharp detective, who has had experience in failures, ought to be able to suggest as much wisdom as to future action as any one else, more particularly one of a judicial mind or one who has had judicial experience in such cases. If any of our members here were magistrates and had to deal with the enforcement of the License Act, they would know how difficult it is to enforce that Act, and there you are dealing with men a good deal like the rascals we are trying to reach with the Medical Act for the benefit of the public. I agree with Dr. Macbell. I think it is well, if we have a committee at all, that they should be in Toronto, where their labors should not be attended with much expense to the Council, and I think this committee would be able to give as good advice as the other committee proposed, and they certainly should say to Mr. Wasson that he should not run to all parts of the country when he gets a little hint that something is wrong, that he ought not to go until some medical man or some person in that locality assumes the responsibility of placing, as far as he can, substantial evidence in his hands in order that a prosecution might proceed, and when that has been obtained I think it is well that it should be submitted to this committee. Whilst I quite agree with the motion to have the committee, I do not look for a vast improvement upon prosecutions in the future over the past, because I say if you attempt to get hold of those fellows they are a class of men always, I think, who will not scruple to make a statement, after kissing the Bible, that is not in harmony with the truth, and they won't scruple to do anything to get others to do the same in order to relieve them of the punishment that is likely to be inflicted upon them. I agree with the suggestion of Dr. Moore that the Act should be altered so that the punishment should be progressive as it is under the Liquor License Act. I think under the Liquor License Act the punishment for the first offence is \$25.00 to \$50.00, the next \$50.00 to \$100.00, and the punishment for the third offence is imprisonment without fine, and a surrender of license. These are my views. I concur in the appointment of this committee, and I hope good will come out of it.

Dr. BARRICK—There is just one thing I wish to be perfectly clear upon; I am not sure whether I understand this motion right. Is it the understanding that in all cases where the Prosecutor assumes the responsibility himself of taking proceedings that he himself is responsible for the expenses of those proceedings, and he gets the fines in those cases?

Dr. MOORE—That is correct.

Dr. BARRICK—And that any case where he is doubtful, where he might say, "Here is a case in which I am not sure whether the fines will pay me for my trouble," he will submit to this committee, and if this committee undertake to recommend the prosecution, then this committee commit this Council to the expense of those prosecutions and the Council will get whatever fines come from them?

Dr. MOORE—That is our idea of what the understanding should be.

Dr. ARMOUR—You are under a misapprehension as to how it is at the present time. We now pay our Prosecutor \$600.00 a year salary, and if his fines do not amount to sufficient to cover his expenses, then he must meet them out of that salary.

Dr. BARRICK—That is what I say. I understand he gets \$600.00 a year apart from prosecutions altogether.

Dr. ARMOUR—And he pays his own expenses.