

thwarted his search work. He espied two foreigners who didn't quite appreciate his right to go through their travelling bags and pockets and were willing to make the proper sort of objection.

At this point the conductor took a hand in the proceedings. "What authority have you got to disturb the passengers on my train as you are doing," he shot at the disturber of the peace, and added, "If you are a whiskey detective, show your credentials." The person addressed swelled with importance, was not to be hoodwinked was not to be bluffed. "Where are your credentials?" The self-styled whiskey detective then pulled from his pocket a scrap of paper with no printing on it, or nothing of an official nature about it save the word "Inspector" following the name of the signature—a scrap of paper. I thought we had finished in the Province of Ontario dealing with scraps of paper. It proclaimed in a few words to the world that so and so was a whiskey detective and in the Province of Ontario had the right, without a warrant, to search even the mind of anyone he wished to. Still the stubborn conductor was not satisfied and he made no bones about it, saying so. He forbade any further disturbance of passengers and told "Mr. Man" to leave the foreigners alone.

At Brockville the conductor saw him leaving the train with the grip and coat which supposedly belonged to the first passenger accosted, and who had long since made his get-away. "Where are you going with those?" asked the 'Con.' "To the police station at Brockville." "No, you are not, they are not yours," he was informed.

The conductor now took charge of the whiskey detective, coat, bag and all, and placed all three in the station agent's hands, called up the chief of police, and an escort was sent up to the station for the travelling "Tec." It is said that he spent a little while in the jail until word could be got from Ottawa as to his standing. And it turned out that he was a sure-enough whiskey detective operating in the Province of Ontario.

Do you wonder I say it is a marvel to my mind that the free British subjects of the Province of Ontario put up with that sort of thing? I have sometimes hung my head in shame to think, as I read the accounts in the daily press, of the glee with which our friends, the Prohibitionists, manifest over the hauling to court and fining of the numerous members of the medical profession who have suffered, because they dared to use their own judgment, under this most unjust Act. When I recall the fact that of all the learned professions there is none more noble, self-sacrificing or more desired in times of sickness or disease than that of the medical profession, I wonder under what set of circumstances this Government could have penalized this noble profession as has been done in this Province. The great number of medical men who have been fined surely precludes one thinking or saying that these men are all rascals, or that they are anything but worthy members of the great profession to which they belong. Surely the infringement of this harsh law by these men may in most cases be to their credit rather than their condemnation, since to me the majority of them seem to be men of character and courage, who in the exercise of the professional skill to which they have been trained, refused to bow to the dictates of wild fanaticism such as is expressed in the carrying out of this unjust act. Let us picture for a moment the home of any one of us here in this House to-day. The moment that sickness or accident comes, what do we do? We call for a doctor. Why? Because we hope to get from him, who is skilled in his profession, relief for the sufferer. Under such circumstances, how glad we are to see the medical man. Take again the druggists. The result of the Ontario Temperance Act has been, in many instances, an attempt to turn the drug stores into blind pigs. I have spoken to several druggists who have plainly told me that the handling of liquor in their stores, as they would have to by reason of the necessity for securing business, not necessarily the selling of liquor, but the ordinary druggist trade, is entirely distasteful to them, because they fear that they, through a simple error of judgment, may lose their reputations in their communities, and be held up and fined. Is there any member of this House who has not had some personal experience of the great shadow which has overcast the world during the past four years, who has not some knowledge of the personal sacrifices made either in his own family or of that of dear friends or acquaintances?