

Federation Discusses Evidences Of Violation Of The Prohibition Act

Lack Of Public Information, Coupled With Widespread Evidences Of Law Violation, Complained Of By Several Members Of Temperance Organization At Annual Meeting Last Tuesday.

Interesting discussion on various phases of the Prohibition enforcement question took place at the public annual meeting of the Temperance Federation, held on Tuesday at the Y. M. C. A. The following report is supplementary to the details appearing in yesterday's Guardian.

Rev. Mr. Nicholson: "Are we to have the Attorney General or some enforcement officer—Inspector Fripps for example—here today? It has been customary for us to have a chance to have conference with these responsible bodies."

The Chairman (Rev. Mr. Webster): "In answer to your question, the Premier is in Summerside at the Supreme Court. His attendance there is imperative; he can't get away from that. I was in conference with him last week, and with the Inspector no later than yesterday. The Inspector would have been willing to come here today but he had matters of enforcement to care for personally at North River. But both the Premier and the Inspector are very happy to receive at a time that would be convenient to the continuing committee, and would give them every consideration in the matter if they can."

Rev. Mr. Nicholson: "It seems a pity that we couldn't get the information today. We have only one meeting a year. Now the Commission is not in session it does seem a pity the Attorney General didn't appoint somebody, or make some arrangement."

The Chairman: "See your point, that there ought to be some approach to the Government where a responsible body like the Temperance Federation—since the Commission is not now in existence—might have at its hand all the necessary information concerning sales and number of scripts, etc. I would like to say, however, that no information that I have asked for from Inspector Fripps or the Premier has been withheld."

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "But, Mr. President, Inspector Fripps is not under the Provincial Government. That is the question. What is the relation of the R. C. M. P. to the Provincial Government? That is where we are in the dark."

The Chairman: "It is quite evident that the R. C. M. P. are under authority from the Federal Government; yet they are working in sympathy and co-operation with the local Government."

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "But they are not under the Provincial Government, as I see it."

The Chairman: "No, and here is a case in hand. A vessel was discovered within the twelve mile limit a few weeks ago. They were able to get away from the patrol boat because of faster engines. They traced the boat to the Magdalen Island, and brought the boat and crew back to this Island. In the meantime, of course, the liquor allegedly carried was taken off the boat. The boat has been held here for three weeks pending instructions from Ottawa. The instructions came through this week-end to release the boat. They had nothing definite against them."

Rev. Mr. Nicholson: "That would relate to the question of contraband. But while the R. C. M. P. are organized under the Federal Government, the fact does remain that they have entered into a contract with our Provincial Government to render several services to the Province, and my own feeling is that so far as those services are concerned they are responsible absolutely to the Provincial Government."

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "That is what we would like to know: has the Provincial Government any jurisdiction over the R. C. M. P. I guess if they have."

Paid For Services

Rev. Mr. Staver: "Then why do they touch our Prohibition law at all? But that is not the point. Why shouldn't the Premier be here today and give some information regarding what is being done? He gets his extra five hundred dollars for looking after this. The Supreme Court can't keep him here if we want him here. He is not so absolutely necessary as that. He is only a servant of the people, and if we want him once a year his duties at Summerside could be looked after by deputy. It looks to me like a case of avoiding his duty."

very well the pressure that is being brought to bear, opposed to ours. But because of his integrity and his sincerity, my feeling is that he ought to be here to unload his difficulties upon us and associate us with him in order to combat that pressure and to help him in the serious task he has undertaken. I feel this so strongly that I would be inclined to favour telephoning him, to ask him to be here for an hour. So far as the Supreme Court is concerned there is no doubt in the world that he could delegate his duties to somebody. At all events, if he can't be here he ought to delegate someone to be here."

The Chairman: "I agree that the committee should have got in touch with the Premier in advance and arranged the meeting accordingly. We are at fault, and we take the blame. So far as a representative is concerned I believe we can get somebody from the Government today."

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "Is that the President of the Council?"

The Chairman: "Mr. LePage I think would come."

Rev. Mr. Nicholson: "It would be very vital, I think, I don't think I would be present at an ordinary meeting, where there is no opportunity of obtaining information from responsible persons."

The Chairman: "Mr. Nicholson did not see me in this connection but it was too late. My attitude is that if you are going to get information, it must not be from an antagonistic standpoint. We must get co-operation. It is no matter of partisanship."

Rev. H. D. Raymond: "May I say that I don't think it is quite desirable that we ought to ask the Premier to come here. He has thousands of duties to attend to here as well as us. He has granted audiences whenever we have asked him. Why should he come to talk to a public meeting and perhaps say something which would get into the press and which would make it more difficult to discharge his duty? Whether he is sincere or not I don't think we have to deal with that; but I think it would be asking too much to ask him to come here to talk to us. I am not biased in the slightest degree."

Mrs. W. A. Thompson: "I feel here to the committee, as one member of the committee, that the criticism of the Premier is unfair. He has been very open and above-board, and he has expressed himself not only to the continuing committee but in the press which all may read. If there is any criticism I think it should come on the committee."

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "I agree that it would be out of place for the Premier to come here and talk to us."

Rev. Mr. Staver: "He is the Attorney General too."

Sole Administrator

Rev. Mr. Baker: "That is the point. We are not asking for the Premier of the Province. It is the Attorney General, who has gathered up into himself the administration of the law, and there is no other possible way of getting information."

The Chairman: "That is not correct."

Rev. Mr. Baker: "This meeting represents the people who put the prohibitory law on the statute books, and unless we send a select group to get information that never gets beyond the select group, privately, what do we know? I am quite free to state that I am not so sure of the sincerity of Premier Campbell. I have letters on my file to show where he made promise after promise and has never implemented them."

The Chairman: "I have to state that I have never been refused an audience, and the information we asked for we obtained. If we have any information that Mr. Baker wants to know today, we will be very glad to give it to him, or the Premier, or the committee, or to get it. But I think we ought to be fair. The Premier was not invited to be here, either as Premier or Attorney General. Inspector Fripps was not asked to be present; but I have information which, if you want it, I shall be very glad to give."

Rev. Mr. Staver: "We were asking for the Premier, as Attorney General, who has wiped out the Prohibition Commission and taken its place. We feel that we have a right to ask the Attorney General personally what is being done. We certainly don't want to reflect on the Premier, but we have to consider him in his other capacity."

The Chairman: "The situation is this, it never occurred to one member of the committee to invite those gentlemen here today. You were longer on the committee than I have been, and in fact it was your business to see that this was drawn to the attention of the committee."

Report Requested

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "The only thing that we could expect would be a report from the Attorney General, who has now taken the place of the Prohibition Commission. It is our right to have that information."

The Chairman: "It is impossible to have the Attorney General here this afternoon, or Inspector Fripps either. If it is your desire to have Mr. LePage here, I shall be glad to invite him."

Mr. R. A. Profit: "Mr. LePage couldn't attend in the capacity of Attorney General. That would be useless."

The Chairman: "Were the men ever asked to come before?"

Rev. Mr. MacLeod: "No, but the chairman of the Prohibition Commission has been asked, and he has appeared and given a report of his stewardship."

The Chairman: "He was not there last year."

Rev. Mr. Nicholson: "It is a regular custom on both sides. I remember one time Mr. Fripps couldn't come, and he sent a representative."

The Chairman: "There were no representatives of the Government or Police force here last year."

The meeting took recess, resuming conference at 2.30 p. m.

Unlimited Scripts

After prayer by Rev. Mr. Nicholson, the Chairman reviewed the morning activities and invited questions.

Rev. Mr. Nicholson: "There are several questions; that we might discuss. There is reported to be an increase of \$14,000 in government liquor sales in the first four months of this year. Then there is the question of these doctor's scripts. In the past, it seems to me—while we never thought that Government did the decent thing in the matter of law enforcement—yet this year fifty scripts per month were supposed to be the limit. In fact we never thought of more than fifty, and if anything of the kind happened we felt that there was something loose and wrong somewhere. Now we are told there is no limit—that if a doctor uses all he has and writes in for more, he gets them. We have a case of one doctor who doesn't do any regular practice, who has written a limit in a month. That would seem a fairly easy thing to answer. You will remember that at one of the conferences where I happened to be present the Attorney General authorized Inspector Fripps to go ahead and prosecute one or two of the most flagrant practitioners, assuring us that even if conviction was not obtained they would be cut strictly off. Am I not right?"

The Chairman: "Yes; these are problems that have been faced by the committee and have been dealt with, with the Premier, and in some cases with the prosecutors. With regard to the increase of sales for the first four months of this year as compared with the first four months of last year, some of the members of the committee got this information from the Attorney General's department. We asked for it and it was withheld. Now it is true that as compared with last year and the year before the sales for the first four months of this year were considerably increased. We asked why that should be; and the reason given was that illicit liquor was so scarce that those who desired it had to take this medium to procure the liquor they desired. That brought into play the abuses of the script system on the part of certain doctors. And again, we say that many of our best practitioners are very fine citizens and are not abusing this system at all. There are just a few. I have here the report of the number of scripts given by the doctors for the months of April and May. Now we know that the supply of liquor has certainly been cut off in a very large measure—that is the illicit liquor. The new twelve mile limit has made it easier for the doctor to get his liquor, and they have a great many more prescriptions amounting to \$3,000 or \$4,000 in some cases. There were 227 convictions this year up to November 30; which shows that the illicit liquor is not coming into the Province as it did. Comparing the number of scripts issued with previous years, the scripts issued this year are greater than that of last year and the year before, but they are practically the same in number for the years 1928-1933. In other words, in the years 1928-33 approximately 27,000 scripts were issued per year. It will be in the neighborhood of that same amount this year; that is, considering the numbers that have been given out so far. But in the years 1923-27 the number of scripts issued approximated somewhere in the neighborhood of 37,000 and 38,000, so that you will see from these figures we are in a very much better position than we were in the years 1923-27. In 1920 there were as many as 50,000 in one year. So that it is practically cut in half, so far as issuance of scripts is concerned, now. Let us remember that during part of that time the Commission was in force and had some supervision at least over the issuance of scripts. These are the facts obtained from the Attorney General's office and can be substantiated by evidence that he has there. With regard to the abuse of this system on the part of a small number of doctors, we have brought pressure to bear upon those who are abusing the system. In other words, as from today three of the most flagrant violators—they are not really violators because there is no law at the present time—no number, rather—but those men have been cut off as from today. The Premier hopes that through these disciplinary measures he will be able to curtail the abuse of that system so far as the medical profession is concerned. Now we ought to be cognizant of the fact that we are not the only body which has approached the Attorney General relative to the prohibitory law. We have had recent audiences, but so have the medical practitioners, and they have been before the Council on various occasions this year. They do not intend to have any limit set, so far as they are concerned. They say, 'Give us the law, and if you don't make one out, and who is to say that it will not be filled?' That was done in one case. Perhaps the disciplinary measure may be the best way of handling the situation. However, some of us are of the opinion that there should be a limit of not more than fifty per month per doctor. With regard to bringing into Court doctors who are abusing the privilege, we had that matter up in the summer time in connection with this racket system in Charlottetown and Summerside. With the Inspector we spent a good deal of time in endeavoring to find out who these offenders were. We discovered some of them. Then the question arose, how are we going to charge these doctors, and on what count? There is no limit at the present time, and even if there were a limit the Act specifically states that the doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to discover the doctor who is giving scripts to the vendors of liquor. Now, if you specifically state that a doctor may prescribe liquor for a patient. You get that Doctor up in Court and he swears that this individual needed liquor; who is to say that the doctor was wrong? That is the problem that the police are up against. The only place in my estimation where you can get the doctor on a score of that kind is to