

and should be passed at once, if the sale of these medicines is doing harm in the country, or it is not doing any harm, and in that case we should throw out the Bill; but the idea that for commercial purposes we should put human life in the balance is absurd. I have given a great deal of attention to this subject for over half a century, and if I were to give my own experience perhaps it would be of some value; but I do say that the larger proportion of the deaths of people of this country result from the drugs they take.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—If the hon. gentleman will allow me to suggest; his amendment would not carry out the object he has in view. It would go further than that. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman do not insist for the present, with the understanding that the committee stage of the Bill will not be exhausted until the next sitting, so that we shall have time to prepare a proper clause.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—If the hon. Secretary of State consents, I will withdraw the amendment on that ground.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The object of the last clause is to permit the government to make proper investigation and inquiry, and then to bring the Act in force. If the principle of the Bill is as stated by the leader of the government to prohibit the sale of patent medicines that are destructive to life and health, then we should bring the Bill into operation at once.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—From what I know of the hon. Secretary of State, I am positively certain he is not a good judge of patent medicines. I do not think he has tasted them in 20 years.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Not in 60.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—And perhaps he benefits thereby, but everybody is not of that opinion. Doctors give prescriptions of one kind and another, and they would not be considered of any use by him. I respect the view held by my hon. friend and I will withdraw the amendment and let

that clause stand until the next sitting of the House. In the meantime an amendment will be prepared which possibly may cover the point raised.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—I could understand the argument used against patent medicines if we were prohibiting the manufacture and sale altogether; but we are making a law that permits the selling of proprietary medicines, with the provision that the label shows the ingredients that are contained in the bottle. That is the only difference between this Bill and the law relating to the sale of patent medicines to-day. The proportions may be just as good in Perry Davis Pain Killer to-day as it will be when the manufacturer prints his formula on the label, so I cannot understand why we should deprive those who are the holders of patent medicines, honestly and innocently, when there was no law against them, of the opportunity to sell them.

Hon. Mr. WILSON—I would suggest to the hon. gentleman from Wellington that if the government feel that patent medicines are injurious to people, they should hardly ask merely for the sake of allowing dealers to dispose of a few packages of medicine they may have on hand, to extend the time and give them an opportunity of doing a still greater wrong to the public. It is admitted by the preamble of the Bill that these medicines are injurious to people, and that the public are suffering by it, and will my hon. friend for the sake of the few cents that the grocer may save on account of the sale of these medicines deliberately state here that they ought to have a longer time? Has my hon. friend not the confidence of the government that they will exercise discretion and bring this law into force at the proper time. I see no good object that can be attained by delaying the operation of this Bill. The grocery keepers having drugs or patent medicines on their shelves generally take them from the manufacturers and sell them on commission. Is the hon. gentleman anxious that this business should be continued in the future as it has been in the past? Is he willing that some of these medicines made with wood alcohol, for instance, should be kept