

has received its greatest impetus from the whole-hearted way in which our local Reform Government has acceded to our wishes, and opposed the wishes of our foes.

Under these circumstances, I would ask, why discuss the question of a third party? What would be gained by it? The vote at the next general elections would be split up, but what would be the net result? The whole effort would be neutralized, as a practical result, by the overpowering numbers in the present parties. Where would the Prohibitionists be when the vote came? The Tories would solidly vote for Sir John, and the Grits for Mr. Blake. I look upon Sir John Macdonald as one of the most dangerous foes of the Prohibition movement; but I know well that thousands of Conservatives who are good Prohibitionists, will vote for Sir John every time they get a chance. Even after the famous—or infamous—Yorkville speech, in which the threat was made to smash the "little tyrant" Mowat on account of his identification with the temperance men. Temperance Conservatives vote for Sir John, and so temperance Grits will vote for Blake, who, however, has never opposed the temperance movement, by word or action, who is himself a total abstainer, and a friend of our movement, and who, if there were need for it, and the interests of the Reform party would not be needlessly jeopardised by it, would make Prohibition a "plank in his platform." There is, however, no such need; and if Prohibition wants a leader, let him become like

Yours truly,

A REFORMER.

Toronto, June 13, 1885.

### Parliamentary.

#### THE SCOTT ACT AMENDMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA, JUNE 18.

The House opened at 2 o'clock. A very large number of petitions were presented for and against the Scott Act amendments. Among the latter were the petitions of the Presbyterian Church, and the grand Division of the Sons of Temperance of Ontario. Twenty-eight petitions were presented against the Franchise Bill. After routine the Senate amendments were taken up for consideration. Those applying to British Columbia to apply the act to electoral districts were carried. It appears there are no municipal counties in that Province, and it was impossible to submit the act to the people. The amendments adopted gets over the difficulty, and it was permitted to pass without objection.

MR. JAMIESON moved that the House do not concur in the amendment providing that medical practitioners may keep and dispense liquors for medical purposes. He showed that the safeguards which surrounded the dispensing of liquors would be removed in this instance, as no certificates would be required, and no register of sales would be kept.

MR. HICKER, of Dundas, argued in favor of the amendment, giving as a reason that medical men were permitted to dispense freely other necessities of their practice, and he believed they were too honorable to violate the law.

MR. FOSTER opposed the passage of the amendment, and argued that it would open wide the door to permit liquor to be sold, and would greatly weaken the Act.

MR. FISHER showed that in his country there were members of the medical profession who constantly set the law regarding the sale of liquors at defiance, and did the utmost to bring it into contempt. He instanced the case of two doctors in his constituency, one of whom was fined and the other would have been fined but for a legal quibble.

MR. McCRAVEY said it was not safe to permit the medical profession to dispense liquors without restraint. One of the difficulties being contended against in Halton, was the indiscriminate granting of certificates by several physicians, who thus defeated the spirit of the Act. To allow them to sell and make a profit on the transaction would aggregate the trouble complained of.

MR. PLATT (Prince Edward), as a medical man, said he saw no good reason why the amendment should be agreed to. As far as he was concerned he did not desire to have the responsibility of keeping liquors and dispensing them at the request of those who think they require them. It would place medical men in a difficult position, where they would at times be subject to temptation which it would be almost impossible to resist. He did not think that the medical profession as a whole were favorable to the change proposed. For these reasons, he opposed allowing the amendment to pass.

The division was then taken, resulting in Mr. Jamieson's motion being defeated, and the acceptance of the amendment by a vote of 84 to 75. Sir John Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin and Messrs. Caron, Costigan, Carling and Chapleau, supported by nearly all the followers, voted with the majority. The Liberals almost solidly voted against the amendment.

The next amendment taken up was that permitting druggists to sell, without restriction, medical preparations containing liquors and other preparations containing spirits, but not intended to be used as beverages. MR. JAMIESON objected to this amendment as unnecessary, as he believed druggists now had the power which this amendment proposed to give them.

MR. BLAKE pointed out that the second sub-section, allowing druggists to fill without restriction physicians' subscriptions containing spirituous liquors up to eight ounces, would allow very great latitude in the sale of liquors. He thought it would be best to divide the question, as members who favored making the law clear on the one point might not desire to favor the sub-section referred to.

Sir JOHN said that, having widened the Act and given power to phy-

sicians to keep and dispense liquors, he knew of no reason why they should hinder druggists from doing the same as proposed.

MR. JAMIESON did not act upon the suggestion given, but the amendment was voted against as a whole, with the result of his motion being defeated on a vote of 108 to 56.

MR. BLAKE then stated that although he had voted to make clear the right which it was understood druggists possessed under the Scott Act, he was opposed to the sub-section, which he had pointed out would afford them very great latitude. He favored a motion to strike this subsection out.

MR. JAMIESON then moved to strike out the sub-section. Sir JOHN strongly opposed Mr. Jamieson's proposition, and argued that in voting to retain this sub-section the House would simply carry out the view it had adopted regarding the sale by physicians.

MR. BLAKE showed that it would go much further and open the door to almost unlimited sale by druggists.

After some further discussion, the members were called in and the motion to strike out the sub-section was defeated by a vote of 90 to 75.

The amendment of the Senate to permit physicians, chemists and druggists to sell alcohol and methylated spirits without restrictions or record was struck out without any vote being taken, it being agreed unanimously that the amendment would wholly nullify the Act.

MR. SCHREYER moved an amendment to compel a record to be kept of the spirits sold under the amendments adopted.

DR. HICKER, Dundas, argued against this amendment as likely to inconvenience the medical profession.

DR. FENOUSON, Leeds, said if a physician went into business as a retail dealer of liquor he should be made to conform to the provisions applied to other dealers. The amendment was finally agreed to without a vote.

MR. JAMIESON moved to restore the words expunged from the bill by the Senate which imposed a penalty on medical practitioners who illegally issued certificates to enable liquors to be procured for other than medical purposes. This motion was under discussion when the House took a recess at 6 o'clock.

When the House re-assembled, MR. MILLS argued against permitting any class of offenders to be exempt from penalties for infractions of the law.

DR. HICKER withdrew the objections he had raised, and the words struck out were restored without division. An amendment was also added to bring all persons who issued certificates illegally under the penalties imposed by the Act. This was intended to apply to the exception made in favor of clergymen, who, it will be remembered, were, when the bill was before the House, given power to grant certificates. Some minor technical amendments were passed, when the wine, ale, porter and cider amendment of the Senate was reached.

The reading of this amendment, over which the main fight was to take place, was greeted with cheers by those favorable to it, and by hisses and groans from its opponents. When the uproar, which lasted several minutes, subsided, MR. JAMIESON, moved the following resolution:

"That this amendment be disagreed with for the following reasons: It is a violation of the fundamental principles of the Act, which, when adopted, prohibits the sale of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, and because the Act has been adopted in good faith by the electors of 61 counties and cities of the Dominion, believing that under the express provisions of the law it would continue in force unimpaired for three years, and then only be repealed by the same authority which adopted it; and the passing of the amendment would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament with the electors of those counties and cities; and because the amendment is in direct opposition to the wishes of a large portion of the people of the Dominion, as manifested by petitions to Parliament."

MR. JAMIESON supported his motion by a speech in which he recounted the various steps of temperance progress which led to the adoption of the Scott Act. He claimed that the Act was on trial and should be fairly tested. This, he said, the Senate were endeavoring to prevent, and had made the attempt to destroy the Act in an unfair and unmanly fashion.

MR. SMALL moved an amendment favoring the Senate's proposition but removing its retroactive feature.

HECTOR CAMERON supported this amendment and was replied to by MR. FISHER.

MR. TOM WHITE said it would receive his assistance, as he believed it was favorable to the temperance sentiment of the country.

MR. COLBY took him severely to task for his utterances, and assailed the Senate's action in a most vigorous speech.

MR. CASEY opposed the Senate's action, and the amendment moved by MR. SMALL.

MR. GIROUARD, in a speech full of figures, contended that the only solution of the temperance question was to encourage the use of light wines and beer.

MR. FAIRBANKS said that the Senate's action was an indirect effort to destroy the Scott Act. Instead of cutting down the tree they proposed to girdle it so that it would die.

MR. SMALL moved that the beer and wine amendment shall only come into force in counties and cities where the Act shall be hereafter adopted. This was lost on a vote of 86 to 78. The names are given on the preceding page.

MR. FOSTER claimed the floor, and took up and dissected the arguments of Messrs. Curran and Girouard. He denounced the Senate's action as a relic of Toryism, which he thought had been buried too deep for a resurrection.

MR. HECTOR CAMERON moved an amendment to the effect that in Scott Act counties at the expiration of one year a vote be taken as to whether the sale of wines and beer should be allowed.

MR. IRVINE, in a short speech, assailed Sir John Macdonald for the votes he had given to aid in destroying the Act, and said the Cabinet, in voting almost unanimously as it had, would be held to strict account by the country.

MR. CAMERON's amendment was, without a vote being taken, declared lost. Evidently feeling that all their strength had been put forth on the vote on Mr. Small's amendment, the amendment of Mr. Jamieson was allowed to be declared carried without a division.

This terminated the struggle, and the House adjourned amid the cheers of the temperance members, at 1 o'clock.—Advertiser.