

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—It is used externally with sulphur ointment and others to make them more energetic.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I think we should not interfere with this schedule. Power is given to the minister to add to or take away some of the names that are mentioned, and it is a thing that should be done by experts. Then the Act will be carried out under the direction of officers who will be specially chosen for the purpose.

Hon. Mr. DOUGLAS—Opium, its preparations and derivatives includes everything, and it is not necessary to insert morphine.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—There are no preparations of strychnia. If you have muscovida and its derivatives you cover the ground. But there is another substance which I desire to mention. Wood alcohol, a very poisonous substance, which is used to make up these tinctures. That is the reason I want to add a provision that where alcohol is used it must be pure.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That should go in as a subclause to clause 7. The hon. gentleman very properly says that wood alcohol is a very dangerous liquid, and that the minister should be prohibited from recognizing it as a proper component in any prescription made up. Therefore it should go with opium and morphine under clause 7.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—I know a manufacturer of one of those drugs who uses wood alcohol. The preparation is used externally, but is also used internally in some cases. Therefore, I think it is well to have wood alcohol prohibited.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I should like to ask why tansy is mentioned.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—Because its medicinal properties are used for bad purposes occasionally, like argot, pennyroyal, and Indian hemp.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Formerly it was used very largely as a tonic in connection with whisky, and if it is a poison, a great many people should have been dead long ago.

Hon. Mr. DAVID, from the committee reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again.

THE CO-OPERATION BILL.

MOTION.

The order of the day being called :

Consideration of the report of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce on Bill 5, an Act respecting co-operation.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have the pleasure, not to say satisfaction, of introducing this Bill in the Senate. It was before the House of Commons for three years, and passed there without any substantial opposition. It was referred to a very important committee of that House, comprising many prominent members, including labour representatives and two members of the government Mr. Aylesworth and Mr. Lemieux. A large amount of evidence was taken, and the committee had a number of sittings during the two sessions in which the Bill was under consideration, and that committee came to the conclusion unanimously to recommend its adoption. They were governed in reaching that conclusion by the fact that it was made clear to them that notwithstanding the provincial legislatures had the power to charter companies of the nature described in this Bill, yet, that, owing to the fact that the labour element was distributed all over Canada, the body of the labouring element desired that their legislation should be uniform and secured from the federal parliament. When the Bill came here, it was referred to a special committee, not such a committee as the one which had considered it in the other Chamber, but a special committee before whom interested parties could appear to give their reasons for and against the Bill. A very strong opposition was got up against the measure. It was represented that it would interfere very materially with the retail trade of the country and deputations came from all sides representing that it would destroy their business. I do not hesitate to say that there was no justification for such a conclusion. That opposition was worked up. When organizations like the retail dealers and the wholesale dealers employ agents to watch legislation that may affect them, their agents necessarily, in