

as business men that he cannot. It seems to me that any case submitted to this committee, in which the committee decide to prosecute, the Council should pay the expense, provided there is a loss. If that were decided upon, I think more efficient work might be done and in that way our public Prosecutor would not be out of pocket. We can hardly expect him to go on next year and prosecute where there is any doubt, especially as he has met with a financial loss of \$400.00 this year. We talked this subject over in the Discipline Committee, and thought we might probably make the experiment of approaching the Legislature at its coming session, although we are timid about applying for further legislation; and we thought it well to state our views to the Council so that the Council may form their judgment and act as they deem best. We know that if a man sells liquor without a license, he may be fined \$50.00 for the first offence, with the addition of a month or two months in jail; on the next conviction there is no option of a fine, he has to go to jail for three months; and if he is found guilty a third time, he has to go to jail for four months, without the option of a fine; so that you see in this case the punishment is progressive. But the punishment is not progressive under our Act; and really a designing man with a little capital could put this Council to a very great deal of expense. If we can only obtain from the Legislature the same law as that which applies to liquor sellers, we then would be enabled to put the unlicensed practitioners and quacks to flight to a moral certainty. We spoke to Mr. Cartwright, the Deputy-Attorney-General, on this subject; and Mr. Cartwright thought as we had a precedent in the license law we might safely go to the Legislature and probably get an amendment to our Act. I am making this statement now merely as a suggestion for the information of the Council. I shall be very glad, indeed, if this matter is handed over to such an able and representative committee, as has been suggested by Dr. Machell, in this city. I am very much in favor of Dr. Machell's resolution and I shall vote for it.

Dr. DICKSON—As seconder of the resolution and in answer to Dr. Rogers' remark I wish to say I think that every case should be referred to this committee. I think the Prosecutor should have no option, because it might be that in many cases he would feel from the evidence he received almost certain of securing conviction which to the committee might not perhaps seem just likely to be an accomplished object. The members of this committee proposed by Dr. Machell live in the city and are easily reached by telephone. For those reasons, I think every case should be brought before this committee.

Dr. BROCK—This report and Mr. Wasson's proposition have a bearing on the Finance Committee's report. I find that in the Finance Committee we are about considering this question. We examined the vouchers and looked over the report of the Registrar and over Mr. Wasson's report, and we were also endeavoring to find some recommendation by which we would be enabled to save this Council the enormous expense of these discipline trials. I think if any member of this Council would personally examine the vouchers he would see at once the great leakage which we have had; I have noted one case, that of the Rose trial. This matter was receiving our serious consideration, and I think it was because it was receiving our serious consideration that Mr. Wasson probably has made this proposition. I think Dr. Machell's motion will settle the whole question most satisfactorily. It will remove a great deal of the expense and will prevent Mr. Wasson acting on his own responsibility and leading this Council into expenses that we do not know anything about.

Dr. BRAY—I think Dr. Brock has misunderstood the position of affairs. Dr. Machell's motion suggests a committee for the public prosecution of unlicensed practitioners, a work the Discipline Committee have nothing at all to do with. I take it for granted that Dr. Brock means that Mr. Wasson in doing any work for the Discipline Committee should submit all his evidence to the Discipline Committee before he goes on. Do I understand you aright, Dr. Brock?

Dr. BROCK—Yes.

Dr. BRAY—You have got the two things confused. This motion and our discussion have been in reference to the prosecution of unlicensed persons, a work which the Discipline Committee have nothing to do with. The Discipline Committee have only to do with registered practitioners who transgress. I quite agree with Dr. Brock's suggestion that it should be an instruction of this Council to the Prosecutor to submit everything of this kind to the Discipline Committee before he goes on. It has not been done heretofore and I think it should be done just the same as he would submit to the committee Dr. Machell suggests anything in ordinary prosecutions. But I am very much afraid if Dr. Dickson's suggestion, that every case should be presented to the committee, was acted on they would have a great deal more work than they bargained for; but if they are willing to do it, I am quite willing they should.

Dr. BRITTON—There is just one point in connection with this I wish to refer to. It has already been suggested that it could be arranged in this way, that the Prosecutor could be allowed to proceed with cases in which he was pretty sure he would secure conviction, but cases about which there was even a shadow of doubt he might submit to the committee, and even though they appeared to be doubtful cases, if the committee recommended he would