acts, or behaves as master or mistress or as the person having the care, government or management of any such house, shall be deemed to be the keeper thereof, and shall be liable to be prosecuted and punished as such, although he or she is not the real owner or keeper thereof.

These two articles (195 and 198) brand the place where prostitution is carried on with the mark of infamy and the master or mistress keeping the same or deemed to be the keeper thereof, from his or her doings, with the stigma of criminality, which entails the condemnation of the culprit.

Prostitution is therefore in itself a criminal offence. The fact of practising it is criminal *per se*. The man or woman deriving any profit therefrom commits *ipso facto* a criminal offence. The place where prostitution is carried on, is the object of severe provisions. No person can keep, live in or even frequent the same without exposing himself or herself to the condemnations enacted and without running, *ipso facto*, the risk of being classed in the category of dangerous persons, mentioned in Art. 207.

All these provisions of the criminal law are the basis of the suits, arrests and condemnations which the mistresses of bawdy-houses, their girls and their clients have to undergo before the Recorder's Court or Justices of the Peace. They are so explicit and the facts are generally so clear, that the task of the magistrates is an easy one, and life may be rendered extremely hard to public prostitution when the police are active and vigilant.

In France, in Germany, and generally in the countries where regulation exists, although it is admitted that prostitution in natural law as well as in common law, is an evil, there is no qualified offence in the mere fact of prostitution, and this has enabled those who are in favor of governmental inscription and tolerance, to found and maintain their system.

England and the United States, after repudiating this system, have enacted laws which contain about the same provisions as those of our Code. Prostitution is considered a criminal offence and is punished.

It is, then, quite certain that in Canada, as in the other countries above referred to, the theories of official regulation and administrative tolerance which may be discussed, and even admitted in other countries, are positively discountenanced by our legislation ; are, so to speak, placed under the ban by our law and can be advocated only by the enemies of the law itself in their efforts to have it amended. So long as that law remains what it it, the provincial, civic and municipal authorities have only to submit to it and apply it in all respects.

The city of Montreal is not exempt from that obligation. The Quebec Legislature is the last charter given this great city (62 Vict., chap. 58), after giving to its Council the authority and jurisdiction required on all matters concerning the peace, order, good government and general welfare of the city, among others, " public peace and safety, health and sanitation, decency and good morals " (Art. 299)—confers upon said Council the power, and so to speak, imposes upon it the obligation to " suppress bawdy and disorderly houses and houses of ill-fame and assignation within the limits of the city" (Art. 300, par. 36)—yes, to *suppress*, and nothing less ! The fact is, the Quebec Legislature could not entrust the corporation of Montreal with any other mission than that of doing towards those houses the only thing possible under the laws of this country, that is, to suppress them.

Does that mean that if the City Council has not thought proper to pass a special by-law providing a specific method of securing their suppression, it will thereby be justified in ignoring the law and tolerating what is intolerable under the Criminal Code ?