menting on this measure, I shall dispense with the political side of the question. In my opinion it is not a party matter, for on both sides of the House it has its opponents as well as its supporters.

Let us consider the O.T.A. and the Medical Profession. In so doing, I shall leave out of coisideration the time-worn discussion as to the efficiency of alcohol in the treatment of disease, and half simply consider the relation of our Profession to the enforcing of the Act. What we resent most about the whole situation is the fact that we have been made the official Barkeepers of the Province. This is neither fair to us nor just to the cause. It is most certainly true that the Doctor must have the right to prescribe for his patients whatever is necessary for heir treatment, and he must be the judge of what is necessary. In cases in which the Doctor honestly considers alcohol a remedy for the disease in question, he is permitted by the law to prescribe it. So far the condition is as it should be. But, when a well man, who has used alcohol all his life, wishes to procure it, he too must appeal to a Doctor, and the latter, if fulfilling the law, must refuse. This attaches an indignity to the Profession which few of us fail to resent.

Then, too, the form for an order of alcohol requires a statement of the ailment for which it is prescribed. This demands a breach of professional confidence, and, undoubtedly, leads to some rather evasive answers. One may cite cases, of cancer, for instance, in which, if the information were made public, it would be prejudicial to the interests of the patient. Altogether it is a most iniquitous condition.

The prescribing of alcohol is largely a personal matter. The use of it before the Act came into force was entirely at the discretion of the individual. The cases that require alcohol are comparatively few, a very small proportion of the total of any practice, so we are brought face to face with a condition in which the personal equation is largely uppermost. Take the number of doctors in practice in Toronto, and see how this works out. I have here a letter from the License Board showing the reports of two Toronto Dispensaries during the month of August, 1919, and giving the following as a representative list:

10 pr	escri	iptions and	under	1,015	Doctors.
11. to	25	prescriptio	ns	181	"
26 to	50	"		92	"
51 to	100	"		41	"
101 to	150	"		51	"
150 to	200	"		21	"
over 20	00	"	·)	9	K