

And that the medicine so sold or offered for sale was in his possession at the time of the passage of this Act.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—How long would it take to exhaust this stock of patent medicines which we have heard is prejudicial to public health? Will he be prepared to insert in the opium Bill which is now before us a provision which will enable the Chinamen carrying a large stock to dispose of it in the same way?

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—Opium is a destructive drug, but there are a great many medicines which render good service in some cases. They have got to prove that the medicine which they are charged with violating this Act in selling was in their possession at the time of the passing of this Act.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—All they can show is what is on the bottle.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I think the amendment, if it were properly described, would be described as an amendment for the promotion of perjury, because I am satisfied that if you adopted an amendment of that kind, a great many country dealers would be found, after the expiration of seven or eight years, to have these goods in stock, and that they were in stock at the time this Act passed. If that amendment is passed, it will destroy the virtue of this Bill almost altogether. I quite recognize that there is a good deal of force in the views that the hon. gentleman takes, and there might be some amendment in the Bill to meet the case which he propounds; but I humbly submit the right time to do that is when we come down to the end of the Bill. In connection with clause 19, or immediately before it, a clause might be inserted, which would require to be framed very carefully. I think the House is in favour of protecting the persons whom the hon. gentleman wishes to protect, but if he undertakes to mutilate the 11th clause, the result will be serious.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—This clause itself provides that the man who holds that patent medicine must give the name of the party from whom he purchased it. Does my hon. friend think the man who has the

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN.

medicine in stock will swear falsely, and that the man from whom he purchased it will swear falsely that he did not purchase that medicine from him at the time he stated? He has to show that the medicine was in his hands at the time the Act passed, and give the name of the party from whom he bought it, and that party will be called upon to give testimony as to when he sold the medicine.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—I do not think the postponing of this Act and having it come in force in one year or two years or beyond that will rid many of the country stores of the large quantity of patent medicines they have on hand, and for that reason I feel like supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Wellington. It may be opening the door for perjury. It is really confiscating those people's goods. You are actually destroying the value of those goods which were bought in good faith years ago. The only thing is to prevent the dealers from being fined if they dispose of the goods they have on hand.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Those people are just as honest as any men in this House, and do not commit perjury.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—You must give them an opportunity to get rid of those patent medicines, Perry Davis, Pain Killer and so on. There are many medicines of which they only sell one bottle in six months or a year, and it should be a good defence if they can show they bought those goods before the Act came into force.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The necessity for this Bill arises from the belief that human life is being sacrificed by the patent medicines that are being sold in Canada. Hon. gentlemen propose that the country merchants who have on hand the poison—because you cannot class it as anything else if the estimation of it is correct, and I believe it is correct—for the next two or three years shall be at liberty to poison the public.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—That is an exaggeration.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, it is not an exaggeration. Either the Bill is a necessity