

ceives the certificate and the man who issued it. He will put his opinion against that of the medical man, and, by authority of this Act, perhaps condemn him unjustly. The physician in such case will be ruined in character and ruined in pocket, and to this risk he would be exposed especially in country places where politics run very high in some sections, and where you find some political party will prosecute a medical man of the opposite party, magistrates will be found who will go to work cheerfully to ruin a professional man's character.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I regret very much that the hon. gentleman from Sarnia and the hon. gentleman from Ottawa should have made up their minds to oppose this amendment, because it does seem to me that there is very good ground in the argument which has been brought forward by the leader of this House for the course which he has taken; and inasmuch as I have myself systematically in these debates supported the action of the gentlemen who are in favor of the Scott Act, I would wish most sincerely to be able to pursue that course throughout. But it seems to me that the policy which the hon. gentlemen have thought proper to adopt in this particular instance is an unreasonable one, and I, as a man who professes to be guided as much as possible by the best judgment I can bring to bear upon a question of this importance, am hindered in consequence from giving them the support upon this motion which I have given them hitherto. It seems to me that a justice of the peace is not a proper tribunal to send a medical man before. It must be pretty well known to members of this House the class from which justices of the peace are generally drawn in a province. They are excellent men, estimable men in their proper sphere in life, as farmers or members of society generally. In our Province, at all events, I may say with perfect knowledge of the fact, it very rarely happens that they act in their judicial capacity, and consequently they have not that readiness and experience in weighing and deciding cases, so essential to the proper administration of justice—particularly in a case of this sort. And further I see an objection to the course which the hon. gentleman from Sarnia and his friends

propose on this occasion, that it is reasonable to assume that the informer in this case will carry the information before magistrates who are notoriously in favor of the Temperance Act. The hon. gentleman from Sarnia assumes at once that the man is guilty of the act he is charged with. You may take that man, who is innocent in the eyes of the law until proved guilty, to be tried for his character and position in society before an inexperienced magistrate, or before two magistrates, both of whom are openly and professedly opposed to the very act with which he is charged. They are avowedly members of temperance societies, and strong supporters of the Temperance Act, and that is the tribunal which the hon. gentleman would select, and which he insists upon taking a medical man before to be tried on an information of this sort. These are reasons which have such force in my mind that on this occasion, with great regret I admit, I am obliged to act in a different manner from what I have heretofore done on this important question. I shall, therefore, upon this motion, support the leader of the Government.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried on the following division:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McKay,
Baillargeon,	McKinsey,
Bolduc,	McMillan,
Boucherville de,	Macdonald,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Montgomery,
Carvell,	Northwood,
Clemow,	O'Donohoe,
DeBlois,	Ogilvie,
Dever,	Paquet,
Dickey,	Read,
Glasier,	Robitaille,
Hamilton,	Smith,
Haythorne,	Sutherland,
Kaulbach,	Thibaudau,
McDonald,	Trudel.—30.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Chaffers,	Miller (Speaker),
Chapais,	Power,
Ferrier,	Scott,
Girard,	Stevens,
Leonard,	Vidal,
McInnes,	Wark,—13.
McMaster,	