

HON. MR. SCOTT—In drawing up the Act I had not that in view, and I must say that at that time I had a high appreciation of the medical profession and I did not think it was possible, until after the disclosures that came to light in Halton and Prince Edward Island, that there were men in the profession who would stoop so low as to give the certificates that we have read of—certificates ordering four gallons of brandy for one prescription, or 72 bottles of porter, enough to take a bath in. These were the abuses for the repression of which this amendment was considered necessary, and abuses that the Message from the Commons properly points to. If there is no provision in the law to meet such abuses, I say it is time that that provision was made. Medical men should not be protected when they openly violate an Act of Parliament, and do it for mercenary purposes. I am told that in Prince Edward Island some medical men carry about with them certificates for spirituous liquors which they sell at \$1 each, wholly irrespective of whether they are required for medicinal purposes or not. It is for this reason the House of Commons introduced this amendment. To-day, as far as my knowledge of the Act goes, it does not reach medical men who violate the law in this way, unless you choose to reach them by a provision of this kind, notwithstanding what has fallen from my hon. friend to the contrary. The hon. gentleman has stated there, as part of the record, that a provision does exist for indicting a medical man who gives a false certificate for spirits. This provision asked for is no stronger than the one he quoted, yet he objects to this because he says no adequate reason is assigned for it. No other reason is necessary than the one the House of Commons has given, that abuses have occurred and that this provision is necessary. I myself illustrated on a former occasion the abuses of the law, giving the names of the parties and the quantities of liquors sold under certificates from medical men.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Will the hon. gentleman give us the name of the medical man in Prince Edward Island who peddle certificates at \$1 a piece?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I read the name of the man who ordered four gallons of

brandy and 72 bottles of porter as prescriptions.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The hon. gentleman made a statement that medical men are travelling through Prince Edward Island peddling certificates at \$1 a piece, and I ask him for the names?

HON. MR. ROBITAILLE—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa has given us good reasons why we should insist upon not exposing medical men to what may become a persecution. He states here in the presence of learned gentlemen in this House that a medical man is blameable because he thinks proper to give a certificate for four gallons of brandy or 72 bottles of porter to any man for medicinal purposes. It strikes me that it is very easily explained. Take, for instance, a person who has sickness in his family, living in a country place, and it is necessary, in the opinion of the medical attendant that there should be spirits in the house on account of those who are ill there. He gives a certificate for four gallons of brandy for the simple reason that it is a stock to be laid in, may be for months, to be used for medicinal purposes. Then the hon. gentleman must understand that if you order a barrel of bottled porter, that it contains just 72 pint bottles, and therefore I say that a person living at a distance from a city, where such things cannot be procured, should have a certificate from a medical man in order to get a supply that may last for some months. Who is to be the judge that the certificate has been wrongly issued? Would the hon. gentleman himself pretend to say that a medical certificate was wrongfully issued which, in the opinion of the physician himself, is a correct certificate? Who is going to judge the action of the medical man? The first man you meet in the street may come up and accuse the medical man of having wrongfully issued a certificate, and who is to judge him? He will bring him before the first magistrate he finds—perhaps a magistrate whose name was suggested to the authorities for the purpose of the prosecution which is mentioned by this Act. I say you expose honorable men to be brought before a magistrate who interposes himself between the person who re-