

then that the physician be not allowed to prescribe more than six ounces or at most eight ounces of liquor. Since this epidemic of influenza the requests for prescriptions for a bottle have been more than ever a nuisance. I would like to point out to the powers that regulate such matters, that the physician is often persuaded to prescribe a quart or an original sealed bottle in place of a smaller amount, because the public generally is suspicious of the quality of liquor purchased in other than original sealed bottles and moreover they are asked a price for six or eight ounces that would almost buy a full bottle. The natural feeling of everyone is one of resentment at being "done," and when they are charged 75 cents for six ounces of liquor and \$1.25 for more than five times that quantity in a sealed bottle they feel that they are being fleeced. So they ask the doctor to please let them have a quart. Now I would like to say this: The man who wishes to use liquor as a beverage would not bother the doctor if he could only get six or eight ounces. So why not have a regularly appointed person at the City Hall or elsewhere who would make enquiry as to the needs of the case and put in his hands the responsibility of prescribing the larger quantities and then in case such permit for larger quantity was abused to prosecute the person who had obtained the permit for a breach of the Act. The officer in charge would know from his files whether the same person was turning up at three, four or five-day intervals for a supply in which case it would be apparent that it was being used as a beverage; while, with a physician's prescription the same party might get a prescription from Drs. A, B, C, D. and E on different occasions and keep himself well supplied. My plea along these lines is not so much *pro bono publico* as *pro bono selfo*. I don't like to be bothered and I don't like the responsibility of signing a document containing a clause: "I hereby certify that the amount of liquor hereby prescribed is the minimum quantity necessary for the patient for whom it is ordered." There are cases of chronic hearts where a nip of whisky is as efficient to tide over a bad spell as a whip in the hands of a good driver is to get a horse with a load through a mud hole. To my mind the whip is not good horse feed, nor the whisky good heart feed, but many other physicians' opinion is the contrary. I think that the whisky has its place in therapeutics as the whip has in the equipment of a good teamster. These cases may require only an ounce, but they feel better in knowing that the bottle is on the shelf against a time of need. I have heard of one physician paying \$50 for acting on his belief that a chronic heart case was entitled to have a quart in his pantry. Give the physician the protection he is entitled to, relieve him of a responsibility that should never have been placed upon him. Let some filing system be organized