

Dr. BARRICK—He gets \$600.00 a year and he must bear the expense of these prosecutions, but he gets the proceeds of the fines. This proposition is that he shall do the same thing, only where he is doubtful and thinks he is going to fall short, and it would not be safe for him to assume the responsibility, he will then consult the committee, and when the committee once decide that they shall prosecute they make the Council liable for that particular prosecution, and the Council get the benefit of the fine, if any.

Dr. ARMOUR—That is the intention, I understand, of this proposition.

Dr. CAMPBELL.—Of course, that would have to be afterwards definitely arranged in the new contract entered into by the Prosecutor. The adoption of the report and the amendment will not, of course, definitely fix that.

Dr. WILLIAMS—I think there is one advantage in having a committee, whether it results in cheapening the matter or not. This Council have a responsibility as to the kind of cases that are prosecuted, and when it goes into the newspapers that the Prosecutor has had some person up and fined, the Council of the medical profession are held responsible. Under those circumstances, I think that we should have a committee which would pass judgment on the cases before they are prosecuted, and should know whether or not they are proper cases to take before the public. There are sometimes cases that seem to be vexatious more than anything else and that the profession would be ashamed to have prosecuted, and would prefer that they were not interfered with. I heard of one case, I think in the neighborhood of Barrie, where information was laid and the Council were urged to have a prosecution pushed against a man who was not a registered practitioner, because he had used a syringe. The ground was taken that it was a surgical operation, and that under the Act he was open to prosecution. To my mind, that sort of case would be very vexatious to the public, as well as to the profession. At times sometimes prosecutors, in their zeal, might take some kind of cases that we would rather, for our own reputation and for the pleasure of the public, were left alone entirely; and I think it is a good thing that a share of those cases should be submitted to a committee before they are put before the public on the responsibility of the Council.

Dr. SANGSTER—I agree with a good deal that has been said, and I do not agree with much more. I am not second to anybody in my desire to see those who are breaking the law prosecuted; I think they should be prosecuted condignly; but, as I have already stated, I think this Council is not the body that should have the responsibility of prosecuting them. I know, from much conversation with members, that the great reason why the medical profession is just now so unpopular in our Legislature is due partly to our public prosecutions, partly to our tariff or attempts at a tariff, and partly to a—I do not know what else to call it—pure cussedness on the part of the Patrons and others in the House. I think that when we have a public Prosecutor, and it is understood he prosecutes at his own risk, he is merely like a bloodhound sent through the country by this Council to hunt its prey. If he does that under theegis and sanction of a committee, I think the public will hold this Council much more directly responsible for those prosecutions even than it does now. And I submit that the law is wrong in that matter. I do not care what the feeling of the House is, or what the expressions of Mr. Cartwright may be on the subject, if proper representations were made to the Legislature, and the whole matter was placed properly before the Legislature so as to show that these prosecutions are made not in the interests of the profession, but in the interests of the public, and that it is police work that belongs not to this Council, but to the Attorney-General's office or to some other office, I cannot conceive that we should fail to obtain justice in the matter. I ask you to imagine what would be the condition of the lawyers throughout the country if they were in the same condition? Suppose the lawyers obtained an Act (which they have been too wise to do) authorizing them to appoint a public prosecutor to go through the country and to haul up and fine every township and county clerk and every broker who ventured to draw deeds or to write wills, would the lawyers not in a very short time have as great a howl against them on the part of the ignorant public as the doctors have now? I do think it is and has been a great weakness to this Council that they ever assumed those prosecutions; and I do think that under happier auspices the work might have been placed at first, as I think it might yet be placed, where it properly belongs—not in the hands of this Council, or in the hands of a committee of this Council, and not in the hands of a prosecutor appointed by this Council. I would like to see steps earnestly taken, taken with a firm determination to push them to the end, to place the matter properly before the Government; and I am quite sure that if the Government were convinced that the prosecutions were in the interests of the public, as I am confident they are, steps might be taken to relieve us of what is a very unpleasant and very expensive duty.

Dr. BRITTON—I would like to know before the vote is taken upon this motion, whether this work is to be done gratuitously, because if it is not, it would be far better if the committee consisted only of three members.

Dr. ROGERS—I think you had better add to Dr. Machell's motion that the work of the committee shall be done free of charge.