

THE SCOTT ACT.

Rejection of the Ale and Light Wine Clause.

A Clear and Explicit Vote—The Full Strength of the House of Commons—The Majority and Mr. Blake With the Majority.

OTTAWA, June 18.—The fullest house for many days was gathered in the chamber today when the Scott Act amendments came up. There were 174 members present.

Sir John Macdonald was in his place looking well and followed the whole debate closely. Mr. Blake was also in good shape notwithstanding his long speech of the day previous. All the galleries were filled, the senators turning out in force. Quite a number of ladies watched the debate.

Kagena O'Keefe, Auguste Boile and T. G. Blackstock, all of Toronto, seemed to be the head of the lobby in the liquor interest. The temperance party was led by Mr. Jamieson of North Lanark. He was dressed in Halifax tweed and wore a long red silk sash to his waist. Hector Cameron seemed to be the head of the opposition to the Scott Act.

Mr. Jamieson moved the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate Scott Act amendment bill. He moved that the House disagree on the amendment providing that duly licensed medical practitioners may dispense liquors for exclusively medical purposes, because it would be a violation of the principle of the act which precludes medical men from having an interest in the sale of liquor and because it did not compel medical men to keep a register of sales. Under the law as it stood, medical men could use liquors for medicinal purposes, but there were safeguards surrounding the sale of spirits to them; for instance the medical man had to secure a certificate from two other medical men and the vendor had to keep a record of the sale. This gave the doctors all the liberty they required. The amendment did not give them any further facilities, but removed the safeguards. Mr. Hickey said that in some cases and at times when it was impossible to find a drug store liquors must be resorted to. The physician without liquor in some cases would be as helpless as a medical man without other necessary drugs. He had no idea that the amendment would lead to illicit selling. Medical men were not allowed to sell liquors contrary to law as beverages, nor would it pay them to stand behind a bar and serve out 5 cent drinks.

Mr. Foster said the insinuation referred to was not an insult to the whole profession, as with all other professions there were black sheep among the doctors. The records of the sales already made under the Scott Act proved this. If medical men were allowed to sell without certificates, argument as to the ineffectiveness of the Scott Act would be placed in the hands of the opponents of the act, and it was not desirable that such an argument should be given. Mr. Fisher said that without wishing to cast any unnecessary reflections on the medical profession, he regretted to have to say that medical men were not always the honorable men they had been represented to be by those who had spoken in their defence in the House on this question. He believed it was also absolutely necessary for the due enforcement of the law that medical men should not be allowed to sell liquor in such an unrestricted manner.

Mr. McCraney opposed the amendment inserted by the Senate as dangerous and liable to great abuse. A division was taken and Mr. Jamieson's motion was lost. Yeas, 75; nays, 84. The amendment was then concurred in.

Mr. Jamieson moved that the House disagree in the amendments inserted in the Senate providing that the Scott Act countries druggists might sell preparations authorized under the pharmacy act physicians' prescriptions containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

SPRING & SUMMER

New Goods arrived, and will be arriving during the Season.

I can suit all as to Material and Style. HUGH DUNLOP, FASHIONABLE TAILOR.

Remember the Place—West street, next door to Bank of Montreal.

GODERICH.

Goderich Foundry and Machine Works,

Runciman Bros., Proprietors.

CONTRACTS TAKEN FOR STEAM ENGINES, FLOURING MILLS, AND OTHER MACHINERY WANTED.

Flouring Mills Changed to the Gradual Reduction System.

Horse Powers, Grain Crushers, Straw Cutters, Agricultural Furnaces, Stores, etc., at Low Prices.

All Kinds of Castings Made to Order.

J. B. RUNCIMAN. R. W. RUNCIMAN

Goderich, Nov. 20, 1884. 1884-17

THE PEOPLE'S STORE.

BARGAINS!

GREAT BARGAINS!

FOR CASH

OR PRODUCE.

SEE THE GOODS MARKED DOWN.

W. H. RIDLEY,

Jan. 21, 1885. The People's Store, Goderich

LOW PRICES.

COME AND SEE THE BARGAINS

GROCERIES, CROCKERY WARE, CHINA WARE, STONE WARE, &c., &c., &c.

Also a Large Line of

Moustache Cups, Ladies Cups, Fancy Mugs, Majolica Ware, Vases, &c., which will be sold at COST.

W. MITCHELL

December 12th, 1884. 1874 Hamilton street, Goderich.

BAGAINS FOR CASH

I AM SELLING OFF MY STOCK OF

CLOTHING

AND GENTS FURNISHINGS

At a Greatly Reduced Price for Cash.

THIS IS A GENUINE ANNOUNCEMENT.

ABRAHAM SMITH.

Goderich, Nov. 13th, 1884. 1884

Extensive Premises and Splendid New Stock.

GEO. BARRY,

CABINET-MAKER AND UNDERTAKER,

Hamilton Street, Goderich

A good assortment of Kitchen, Bed-room, Dining Room and Parlor Furniture, such as tables, chairs, hair, cane and wood seated, cupboards, bed-stands, mattresses, wash-stands, Lounges, Sofas, What-Nots, Looking Glasses.

N. B.—A complete assortment of Coffins and Shrouds always on hand also Hearses for hire at reasonable rate.

Picture Framing a specialty.—A call solicited. 1751

BOOTS & SHOES

Downing & Weddup

Beginners to the Public that they have opened business in the above Store in the store lately occupied by Horace Newton. Having purchased a large and well assorted stock of Spring and Summer Goods at close figures, we are determined to give the Public the benefit.

QUICK SALES, SMALL PROFITS WILL BE OUR MOTTO

Please call and examine our goods before purchasing elsewhere.

Remember the place, next door to J. Wilson's Drug Store.

Custom work will receive our special attention.

None but the best of material used and first-class workmen employed.

Repairing neatly done on the shortest notice.

Goderich, March 9 1882. DOWNING & WEDDUP

ART DESIGNS IN WALL PAPER

Now is the time, if you wish one or two nice rooms at home, to see Futler's room paper. He has over

20,000 Rolls of the Latest Designs

Beautiful colors, and at prices less than very much inferior goods. Call and see them. They are the best to be seen in town, and must be seen.

The Latest Spring Bazaar Patterns & Fashions,

AT BUTLER'S

Deacon M'Nab's

The Deacon washed an son's reply to his letter, that Alexander would reply from his own standpoint, knowledge of his disputable He forgot to take into account of marriage, and community where men, fel in matters of cotidian ignominy of many clerical importance to him than lonely, anxious sender sorry at its tone, and he w "I have been a little pious men have long memories as well as for a kindness, year and write again."

But a year passed and B two and three years, and to think he could hardly be less his father requested, be "suspended," if he did, motives. He had better be so year after year passed a silence was unbroken.

In the meantime a "grec taken place in the deacon been so gradual that his rather thought their esteem been wrong than that his alleged. "He is hard w know him, but he me friendship grows," said B had been a familiar fir years. But it was some the mellowing of time, water will wear away a preaching of Dominic P upon the deacon's spirit There had indeed been a had seriously disapproved had even feared he w something very "like Ar through it all very few t the words of Jesus had soul, even in its most ser

In the ninth year of his he began to remember him to find excuses for l very young, and he ha temper and quick tongue, was like a flash of fire nature's "thing mischief" wish I knew where he is I ought, I mean, perhaps kind like to look after him like to meet his mother in if I had fallen in mercy Whatever ray can I m him?"

It was in a mood of thi to church one morning, wandered a great deal un into the words which sh reading—the words in a woman of Tekoh urged back his banished son provided, out the imperfect forgiveness, in that, thoug him back, he suffered his face. Then he turned t the newer dispensation, fir like colors, running to me when afar off, taking hi with kisses of forgiveve gather his friends to re over the son that was lost

When the deacon left was with one fixed part find his son.

"And you'll do right, d dominic:—You are hate and needna fear the fr plenty o' saila to go to t he o' hanna a barbe to oon may have fallen very thought of that?"

"Ay, hays I. If I can ever low he has fallen, and give him a son's portie

"If that is the spirit your ways, deacon, and if you. Where to first?"

"He wrote me a letter the Gulf o' Mexico in T written twice to that pl answer back, for I bid pain o' my displeasure, gane, but whichever wa can tell."

In a month the deaco Orleans, and from the Corpus Christi; but a McNab had lived here i ed by an epidemic of y the population had be shifting one. No one r

"I'll go up to the seat he said to himself; "wh making there'll be lay find the lad among the

So he bought a horse went leisurely through t was in the first week i was lost in amazem There was a pomp and shine and flowers whic ed of; and as he rode blowing grasses and e herds of cattle and f beauty and peace sank said rapturously, "He the earth is the Lor oxygenated atmosphering of exhilaration; singing lines of his smatches of such an "Auld Lang Syne," or "Wallace led." But

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.

A division was called for, and Mr. Jamieson's amendment was lost. Yeas, 54; nays, 108.

Mr. Jamieson then moved the amendment allowing a druggist to dispense medicinal preparations containing not more than eight ounces of alcoholic liquors and patent medicines, and other preparations containing alcohol for other purposes than as a beverage. He did so for the reason that it was unnecessary, as the Scott Act already contained such a provision.

Mr. Sutherland (Oxford) said the College of Pharmacy had taken very high legal opinion on the question, whether chemists could sell in Scott Act countries the compounds mentioned in the amendment, and it was assured that such sales would be illegal. It was in order to protect themselves that the chemists asked for this amendment, and he really thought it should be passed.

How Mr. Blake was of the opinion that under the Canada Temperance Act as it stands no prescription which was really a medical prescription, although it might contain alcoholic liquor, could be prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It would require, however, to be a medical prescription in the sense that it was not alcoholic liquor that could be used as a beverage. But the amendment would go farther and open the door to filling prescriptions containing alcoholic liquors by all licensed druggists without the special certificate or special license required under the act.

Sir John Macdonald said there was no doubt the amendment of the Senate was very wide. At the same time the House had already decided that physicians might dispense liquors, and that under the provision of the amendment to which the leader of the opposition had referred druggists were authorized to do for physicians what they were entitled to do for themselves.

Mr. Hickey said the Scott Act was designed not to prevent the legitimate use of liquors but the abuse of liquor as beverages. When, therefore, it was proposed to interfere with the medicinal use of spirits the intention of the act was departed from.